

# Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. Waikart

DATE: October 2, 1950

FROM : Mr. Nichols

SUBJECT: HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE (Tydings Committee)

- Tolson \_\_\_\_\_
- Boardman \_\_\_\_\_
- Nichols \_\_\_\_\_
- Belmont \_\_\_\_\_
- Harbo \_\_\_\_\_
- Mohr \_\_\_\_\_
- Parsons \_\_\_\_\_
- Rosen \_\_\_\_\_
- Tamm \_\_\_\_\_
- Sizoo \_\_\_\_\_
- Winterrowd \_\_\_\_\_
- Tele. Room \_\_\_\_\_
- Holloman \_\_\_\_\_
- Gandy \_\_\_\_\_

For record purposes, there are attached Parts 1, 2, and 3 of printed testimony of Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Eighty-First Congress, Second Session, pursuant to S. Res. 231 a resolution to investigate whether there are employees in the State Department disloyal to the United States.

This testimony should be indexed.

Attachment

LFN:ich

FBI  
 ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
 HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
 DATE 3/22/85 BY 9115/CJ/f

#264,078 3-19-86 9145 JFE/AG/COL  
 COPY SP-7 mac/DB 6/2/87

*Signed this 1 copy of the  
 cover letter to be placed  
 with the encl. The Orig. copy  
 is in file. 8-10-55 Jow*

ORIGINAL DOCUMENT SENT TO  
 NATIONAL ARCHIVES (JFKARCA)  
 DATE 8/26/96 HSCA Subject

*MORGAN, Edward Preprint  
 DJ*

121-23278-267X12  
 Part 2 appendix  
 pages 1485-2510  
 Part 3  
 Pages 2511-2525

*64-2-24-52*

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
ON THIS ENVELOPE  
IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 3-19-86 BY 9145 JFE/

264,078

SP-7 mac/RB  
6/2/87

Bulky  
121-23278-267X12

**STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION**

---

---

**HEARINGS**

BEFORE A

**SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

**UNITED STATES SENATE**

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

PURSUANT TO

**S. Res. 231**

A RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER THERE ARE  
EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT  
DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES

---

**PART 3**

JUN 28, 1950



STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

---

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

PURSUANT TO

**S. Res. 231**

A RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER THERE ARE  
EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT  
DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES

---

**PART 3**

JUNE 28, 1950

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1950

68970

121-23278-267 X12

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

TOM CONNALLY, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia      ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan  
ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah      ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin  
MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland      H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey  
CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida      BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa  
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island      HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts  
BRIEN MCMAHON, Connecticut  
J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*  
C. C. O'DAY, *Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SENATE RESOLUTION 231

MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland, *Chairman*

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island      BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa  
BRIEN MCMAHON, Connecticut      HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts

EDWARD P. MORGAN, *Chief Counsel*

ROBERT L. HEALD, *Assistant Counsel*      ROBERT MORRIS, *Assistant Counsel*  
WILLIAM J. KLIMA, *Assistant Counsel*      LYON L. TYLER, Jr., *Assistant Counsel*  
MARGARET B. BUCHHOLZ, *Subcommittee Clerk*

## FOREWORD

Upon the recommendation of the Foreign Relations Committee the following transcript is printed as part 3 of the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 231. The discussion recorded below, which was not included in the original printed hearings, took place at a meeting of the subcommittee on June 28, 1950, at which time members of the subcommittee and the staff were canvassing certain procedural matters. In order that this section of the record may appear in its proper sequence, reference should be made to part 1 of the printed hearings, page 1484. The following exchange, which appears on page 1484, is repeated at this point to afford the necessary continuity:

Mr. MORGAN. I assume, then, that it will not be necessary at this point to incorporate by reading all of this into the record.

Senator TYDINGS. I don't see any point in it, but any member of the committee, anytime, ought to be able to go through this and see anything that we have here.

The additional testimony follows from this point.

My opinion is that a lot of it will be just a waste of time.

Senator GREEN. Have we got answers to all the questions?

Mr. MORGAN. I think, Senator, that a great many of them we have the answers to. Yesterday, for example, Senator Lodge asked for certain reports, I believe, in connection with the case of John Service. The Department of Justice has advised me that they do not have any such reports bearing those dates, and they are sending a letter up concerning the whole matter, which we will have later. So I obviously don't have that.

There are some outstanding requests of the Department of State. There is an outstanding request of the Navy Department. There is, I believe, one outstanding request of the Department of Justice and perhaps another of the War Department. There will be others, but a great many of them have been answered, and, of course, that is the material which I have here today.

Senator LODGE. It seems to me that we ought to also get all the papers of the loyalty board in the Service case, and if the loyalty review board passed on it, we ought to get that. I also would like to have the opportunity to question somebody from the State Department with respect to the quality of Service's record before and after the Amerasia case. It seems to me you have got to do that before you can even pass judgment on that case. I don't know whether we will be turned down or not. The Service case was not 1 of the 81, and we may not be allowed to see any of that stuff, but I think we certainly ought to see it because we want to make a judgment on that matter.

Senator TYDINGS. We will look into that.

Senator McMAHON. I think that somebody would come up and testify as to his competency and conduct as a State Department employee. I would be rather disappointed if they wouldn't.

Senator LODGE. I would, too.

Senator TYDINGS. I think we will get that all right, but whether we will get the record or not is another thing. I will have to explore that before I commit myself.

Mr. MORGAN. Incidentally, for the record at this point, in connection with the Service case, Mr. Peurifoy called me to advise the committee in this session, in the event the matter of Service came up, that the press stories to the effect that the loyalty and security board of the State Department has cleared Service are not accurate. The board has not rendered a decision concerning Service and does not intend to do so, according to Mr. Peurifoy, until the State Department has an opportunity to review our record in executive session, if we make it available to them. Furthermore, he advised that he specifically requested to be disqualified to pass on the Service case and that Under Secretary Webb had agreed to review the decision of the loyalty board at such time as it is formally rendered.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Incidentally, there are a couple questions, based on information that I have received just before noon today, that I would like to ask Mr. Service.

Senator TYDINGS. Would you indicate what they are, Senator?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I would prefer not to.

Senator TYDINGS. The only reason I asked was to see if we had covered any of the ground while you weren't here.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have reviewed the questions that have been asked him, and this happens to be a question to ask him.

Senator TYDINGS. This is new matter, you mean?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It involves other individuals.

Senator TYDINGS. In the State Department?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. No. It involves other individuals with whom he may have had some contact. I have received some information that he had contact with other individuals than those that our record discloses.

Senator TYDINGS. What I mean is, would it be pertinent to our inquiry?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It would, indeed.

Senator TYDINGS. How? Would it bear on his loyalty?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator TYDINGS. You don't care to tell us who they are?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Not at this time, because it is purely rumor. I have just received the information over the telephone and it happened just shortly before noon. This information may or may not be accurate at all.

Senator TYDINGS. Don't you think you ought to have a little more verification of that before we, busy as we all are, go into things of that sort? I don't want to be captious about it or anything of the sort. I am just asking for your opinion. You get a rumor. Is the man that gave the rumor willing to support it with any kind of reasonable fact which would make it worth while inquiring into? We can run rumors down from now on to the year 4006.

Senator LODGE. More than that, Mr. Chairman, we could run down perfectly legitimate questions from now to the year 4006 and still not exhaust all the questions that can be asked within the legitimate purview of Senate Resolution 231. That is the defect of this whole set-up.

Senator TYDINGS. I agree with you.

Senator LODGE. We could work ourselves to the bone, and we have worked hard on this committee, and still not scratched the surface of this subject.

Senator TYDINGS. Let me say this to you. My own thought is, and I want to be completely fair to my colleagues in this matter, is that under Resolution 231, we were instructed to inquire into the loyalty of State Department employees, past or present. In connection with that, we had to look into the loyalty of Mr. Larsen and Mr. Service, who are two State Department employees that were involved in Amerasia. I think that I was very liberal, in the absence of some of the other members of the committee, in letting the whole purview of Amerasia go in, as to whether the Department of Justice had done a good job, whether they had been fixed, which wasn't really what we set out to do. We personally set out to keep it within the State Department purview, and I tried to frame the questions, as the examination and cross-examination will note. It went into all phases of Amerasia, even though at times it seemed to me we were getting pretty far away from loyalty of the employees in the State Department. We went into whether Mr. Hitchcock did a good job or not. We went into whether the FBI did a good job or not. We got pretty far away from the State Department in many of our phases. However, it was all done in good faith and in order to be broad and liberal and fair about it.

Now, likewise, in the Lattimore case, Mr. Lattimore never was an employee of the State Department. Nevertheless, we had a great deal



of testimony about Mr. Lattimore and his books and writings and this, that and the other thing. I have done my best and with some success. When nobody thought we were going to get the 81 loyalty files, I went down and got them. I didn't know what was in them.

Senator McMAHON. Untampered with.

Senator TYDINGS. Untampered with. After the charge was made that they had been tampered with, I went to the FBI and said I wanted a check made of this, that if they had been tampered with, I wanted to know it. I am very hopeful that, having proceeded in that vein, we can more and more get back within the purview of the resolution and that we can conclude this hearing, because it is going to take a long while for us to make a study of this and see what report we are going to make. We probably will not agree on many phases of it. Quite frankly, I feel that we have done a good job. We have gone into it and we have all worked hard. This can be off the record.

(Off the record.)

Senator LODGE. Let me make a little statement, Mr. Chairman.

Senator TYDINGS. Certainly.

Senator LODGE. I agree that this committee has worked very hard. I think the staff has worked hard. I want to compliment them on the way they have worked. I know the Senators have put in a tremendous amount of time on this whole matter. However, Senate Resolution 231 is, and I think I can quote it right here, "to investigate persons who are disloyal to the United States who are or have been"—I underlined those three words, "or have been"—"employed by the Department of State."

Now, when you go into that, there are a whole lot of questions that suggest themselves to you that without any strained construction at all are squarely within that purview. I have just jotted down a few of them here that have been asked on the floor by Senators and that have been asked in the press, some of which would take months and years to go into.

What State Department officials were responsible for placing Hiss and Wadleigh in the State Department?

Have we investigated what person or persons were primarily responsible for sponsorship of employment of sexual perverts in the State Department?

Senator TYDINGS. Do you want all this on the record?

Senator LODGE. Yes. I think it would be a good thing for the men who wrote this Senate Resolution 231 to see, because some of them didn't understand what they were getting into.

Has an investigation been made with a view to determining whether those State Department officials who opposed United States recognition of Soviet Russia and who thereafter warned against any appeasement of the Soviet regime were in any way discriminated against or unfairly treated by the Department?

Has an investigation been made of the procedures whereby Communists gain entry into the United States upon the basis of visas obtained through our consular service abroad?

Has an investigation been made with reference to the release of the Soviet spy named Gaik Badalovich Ovakimian on July 23, 1941?

Has an investigation been made with reference to the release of the Soviet spy named Mikhala Nickolavich Goran on March 22, 1941?

Have questions been addressed to Adolph Berle with reference to his statement to the House Un-American Activities Committee that Alger Hiss belonged to the pro-Russian clique in the State Department?

Who in the State Department was responsible for obtaining the services of Frederick Schuman and Owen Lattimore as speakers for the Department's indoctrination course for Foreign Service employees? I have had many people ask me that.

Has the subcommittee investigated the charge that a State Department security officer whose decision that 10 members of the Department be discharged was subsequently reversed by higher authority?

What State Department officials were responsible for the advice given higher officials that the Soviet Government would allow free elections in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the other satellite countries?

Has the subcommittee investigated the facts surrounding the case of Arthur Adams, an alleged Soviet atom spy, who was permitted to leave the United States in 1946?

Now, any one of those questions would be good for 6, 7, or 8 months of the year.

Senator TYDINGS. That is right.

Senator LODGE. Take the Lattimore case alone. We have got nothing in the record to show where Lattimore's precise relationship with the State Department has been set forth by an official of the State Department. I don't think the State Department has answered for the record, whether the relationship to the State Department which Senator McCarthy applied to Lattimore was correct or not.

Senator TYDINGS. How about the four letters from the Secretaries of State?

Senator LODGE. Do you think that that completely clears up his relationship with the State Department?

Senator TYDINGS. I think as far as that phase of it is concerned, they said they didn't know him, that as far as they knew, he had no influence in molding foreign policy.

Senator LODGE. They said that, but did they set forth his exact place on the Reparations Commission to Japan, his exact appointment as lecturer?

Senator TYDINGS. That has all been testified to, that he was appointed at the request of Ed Pauley on the Presidential Mission, not with the State Department. That is in the record.

Senator LODGE. All right, I will look it up again.

Senator TYDINGS. I remember it.

Senator LODGE. Let me ask you this: Has the subcommittee questioned all persons mentioned by Budenz as having had relations with Lattimore?

Senator TYDINGS. Yes.

Senator LODGE. Have we all of them?

Mr. MORGAN. All persons?

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. In what sense?

Senator LODGE. Have we had them in and questioned all the persons mentioned by Budenz as having had relations with Lattimore?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Budenz named in executive session a great many contributors to Pacific Affairs, the publication with which Lattimore

at one time was associated. Of course, we have not interviewed all of them. There were some 16, as I remember.

Senator TYDINGS. Lattimore specifically answered each one of the charges that Budenz had made or that anybody had made. I remember that in his testimony. I don't recall it specifically, but I do know he took up one thing after another.

Senator LODGE. We haven't questioned them all, I don't think.

Mr. MORRIS. Lattimore hasn't been in since the second Budenz testimony.

Senator LODGE. Have we questioned those who have headed the China desk in the State Department to determine whether Lattimore gave advice on United States policy for China and whether this advice was acted upon?

Have we questioned the United States Ambassadors to China who were there during that period in order to get answers to those questions?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In that connection, may I say that I talked to them about 4 weeks ago. I have been trying to locate their signatures so that I can present them. I talked to a Chinese representative here who told me that in discussing Chinese matters with the State Department he had been on repeated occasions sent to Owen Lattimore from the Far East Section of the State Department. They said, "Well, you see Lattimore about that."

Senator TYDINGS. Well, what of it? That doesn't make him an employee of the State Department.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. No; but it goes to the question of his influence.

Senator TYDINGS. We are not trying his influence. We are investigating whether State Department employees have been disloyal, and Lattimore is not a State Department employee.

Senator LODGE. I would like to just complete this; it wouldn't take me very long.

Senator TYDINGS. Excuse me.

Senator LODGE. On the question of asking the Department of Justice whether they have had any new information respecting Lattimore since that date, I think it was March 24 that we went down and saw the summary of the file.

Senator TYDINGS. By "new information," do you mean derogatory or general information?

Senator LODGE. I understand they were conducting a surveillance of them or an examination of them or a study into them.

Mr. MORRIS. As I understand it, they had 70 FBI men working on Lattimore subsequent to that.

Senator TYDINGS. Who told you that?

Mr. MORRIS. Well, I heard that from about four or five different sources.

Senator TYDINGS. Name me one, so we can judge and measure the authenticity of what you heard.

Mr. MORRIS. One of them was a man named Nelson Frank.

Senator TYDINGS. Who is he?

Mr. MORRIS. He is a man who used to work for the Navy. He is a newspaperman. He is in New York. Apparently he is recognized by the Bureau as something of an expert on Communist literature. He gets frequent calls from the FBI.

Senator TYDINGS. What are we trying to find out about Lattimore, Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. I think the principal charge is he was the architect for our far eastern policy.

Senator TYDINGS. How does what you told me, 70 men of the FBI looking into, make him the architect of our far eastern policy?

Mr. MORRIS. I am sorry, I didn't hear that question.

Senator TYDINGS. How could he be the formulator of policy if he wasn't in the State Department?

Mr. MORRIS. I can think of one thing. He was one of the principal consultants last October, when they had the conference.

Senator LODGE. The question I raised was very simple. On the question of asking the Department of Justice whether they had any new information since March 24, they can say, yes, we have and we don't want to tell you or they can say no, we don't have, or yes, we have.

Senator TYDINGS. I shall ask that question and put the letter in the record. I think it is a very proper question.

Senator LODGE. They asked us all to come down and look at this summary.

Senator TYDINGS. I think it is a very proper question.

Senator LODGE. It is just a question of bringing the thing up to date.

Senator TYDINGS. That is right.

Senator LODGE. Now, at the hearing on April 25, Budenz stated that he would furnish the subcommittee with names of Communists whom he knew to be in the State Department. Have we received that list?

Senator TYDINGS. Yes, I have got a letter from him in which he says he has been very busy and hasn't had time to get around to this yet, that sometime in the autumn he hopes to have time to devote some attention to this.

Senator LODGE. Budenz says that?

Senator TYDINGS. Yes.

Senator LODGE. Will that letter be in the record?

Senator TYDINGS. You will put it in the record.

Senator LODGE. I think it ought to be in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. I have got the letter somewhere. The reason I haven't brought it over here is that I didn't think of it, for one thing. Another thing is he says he wouldn't be able to do something until autumn. He sent a copy of it to each one. He says on the letter to me a copy to so and so and so and so. I think every member of the committee got a copy of it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I got a copy.

Senator TYDINGS. He says that on there. That is the reason I didn't bring it up.

Senator LODGE. I think it ought to be in the record for the sake of completeness.

Mr. MORGAN. I have my copy to incorporate in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. You have got a copy. Put it in the record. That will take care of that.

Senator LODGE. Have we contacted and investigated all those whom Lattimore is supposed to have brought in to the Institute of Pacific Relations? If not, I think we ought to do something about that.

Mr. MORGAN. That, Senator, is a bridge that I think we ought to cross right here. To propose to undertake an investigation of that

character, you might just as well give up all hope, with the existing facilities, and you might as well get set for an investigation that will extend over 1 year at the very least.

Senator LODGE. All right, now, I want to talk about that. I want to make my little speech about that. I have asked all these questions, and I think the questions are obviously questions that fall within the purview of this Senate resolution. However, with the congressional committee machinery, we could sit for another year or 2 years and we still couldn't get to the bottom of all those questions. In all the years I have been here, I have never been on a committee where people worked harder and where a more sincere effort was made.

Senator TYDINGS. I have had to do 3 or 4 hours on the committee in addition.

Senator LODGE. You are the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and you have a lot of other things to do. I have never been on any other committee where the members put in more time and worked harder. However, the nature of a congressional committee is such that the Senators haven't the time and, in most cases, haven't the expert background, and the tools which a congressional committee has, which are the publicity and the furnishing of facts on which public opinion is formed, are not the tools that you need to apprehend the existence of disloyalty in Government departments. What you need there are detectives and secret work, which a Congressional committee does not have. So I think that if we sat from now until doomsday, this committee, with the other things it has to do, which we as Senators have got to do, which are just as important as this, could never get to the bottom of the question of who hired Alger Hiss or how about all these people that Lattimore got into the Institute of Pacific Relations. Therefore, at the proper time, I am going to renew my motion that a trained bipartisan commission of experts be set up to go into this thing, under the seal of secrecy, with a definite requirement that no report be made until well after the election, taking this whole thing out of politics, getting to the bottom of it, and let the chips fall where they may. That is the system that has been tried in other countries and they have gotten a lot of results from it.

I wanted to make that statement fully and frankly here, because I intend to make it in public later, and I don't want to have you gentlemen learn my views in public for the first time. I want you to hear it here.

Senator TYDINGS. I think there is a great deal, Senator Lodge, in what you say. I am not out of sympathy or in disagreement with any of the fundamentals you have expressed. Take my own situation first. In addition to what each other member of the committee has had to put in on this, I have had to put in probably 2 hours extra each day because of the mail coming to me, and I have carried, you can imagine, a pretty heavy load here.

Now, I think we have done a pretty thorough job. I don't say that we have explored every bay and inlet and river and rivulet or we haven't explored it. I am not passing on that. What I would like to do is to take what we have got and present it to the Senate and come to some recommendation that we might all agree upon for a further continuance of this thing. Now, I can't see where anybody can be hurt on that score. My own conscience will be clear and

my sense of the discharge of the duty will be clear, because I have worked like the devil on this case.

Senator LODGE. I don't understand what you say about a continuance.

Senator TYDINGS. I say, we will take the evidence that we have now and make any conclusion we want from it, either in agreement or three different versions or five different versions, or any way we want to do it, and that incorporated in our general findings there be some provision and recommendations for a further pursuit of security under whatever mechanics we decide, either along your line or some other line.

Senator LODGE. Not necessarily by this same subcommittee?

Senator TYDINGS. We would be out. They would take it over and go ahead with it. I don't think we can do much more than we have done. I think it is like a sculptor. He takes his clay and he gets it in general shape. Now we are down to where the refinements come in, and we haven't got the time to go into all these things. My opinion is that we ought to make our findings on what we have and make a recommendation, which I am sure will be honored, that there be further pursuit of this proposition. By that, I don't mean this particular evidence. I mean anything that is in the picture at all that has to do with better security for the country, I am with it.

Senator LODGE. Off the record.

(Off the record.)

Senator TYDINGS. I haven't talked this over with my colleagues; I will tell you that in good faith. I haven't talked it over with Senator Green or Senator McMahon, but I have reached the conclusion that I want above everything else, this country to be secure against the bad people in it, particularly in the present time. While I have done the best I could do, and I think a pretty good job was done by all of us, in getting the essentials of what brought us into being before us for some consideration, I am not content to leave the matter go without further pursuit by people who have the time and the effort and everything else that can be made to do the job.

Senator GREEN. I may say I am in entire sympathy with the general principles, but whether I would be for any particular plan will be another matter.

I ought to be excused. I talked with my office and there are people who have been waiting for sometime over there to see me.

Senator TYDINGS. I would like to get some expression from you, Senator Green. I would like to get this from you today. I would like to have Mr. Morgan complete this record with such other information as has been requested to be furnished us in writing. Then I would like to have all of this made available and have the committee make whatever findings it wants to make and ask for such other pursuit of it as is necessary. I have no objection. I don't care. I don't want to drop it.

Senator GREEN. Somebody ought to make a tentative draft. That is the only possible way of getting at it.

Senator TYDINGS. I mean the committee ought to bring in its findings. We can say they are imperfect, if we want, or we can say that we have done the best we can.

Senator GREEN. My point is to get down to earth. Someone has got to make those findings or a draft in order that we may come to an agreement.

Senator TYDINGS. Make a motion, then, so we can get your point of view on paper.

Senator GREEN. Well, I would suggest that the counsel for the committee make a draft report for this committee that we can discuss, in the first place. When you once have that draft report and have been over that, then we can discuss the findings.

Mr. MORRIS. May I say, Senator, that the first basic request that I made in commencing this investigation was for the books and records of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, inasmuch as there was evidence that his money was the heart of the Communist cell in the Institute of Pacific Relations. I maintain that that was necessary. It was basically necessary to start that kind of an investigation.

Senator TYDINGS. There isn't anything, Mr. Morris, that isn't pertinent, and we can keep on asking for things, and there is no doubt in the world that would be a good thing to get, and you could ask for 5,000 different things, but we are pretty far away from loyalty in the State Department when we get out in the Institute of Pacific Relations with our little force. We just haven't got it.

Are you ready for a discussion?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I want to make an observation on that. I think it would be an utterly futile thing to make a draft report at this time. I consider we haven't even scratched the surface.

Senator TYDINGS. How long do you think it would take us to do it?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I don't know how long it will take us, but I would like to see us get into some of the ramifications of these witnesses as the only way way that you can develop evidence upon which you can base any final conclusions, and I will have to oppose such a motion at this time.

Senator GREEN. It seems to me that we have done all that we need to do in connection with the job that was imposed upon us. We have examined the case of everyone who has been accused, by name or by number corresponding to the name.

Senator LODGE. If the Senator will yield, we were not directed by the resolution to do that.

Senator GREEN. No, but we have not supplied want ads in the paper to find additional ones. We have had plenty of publicity about this committee's work, and we would have had other names suggested to us if these people who are constantly writing letters to us had names to offer.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. We have 20 or 30 names that I think we ought to look into.

Senator GREEN. I say, all that have been presented to the committee, I think we have examined.

Senator TYDINGS. I think we ought to reach a decision here today. I think we have done an exceedingly hard lot of work. This committee has worked hard and turned up all the essential facts. We have got to admit that there is a great field of endeavor here which we, as Cabot says, are not qualified to do. It would take us years, take much more money, take more investigators.

Senator GREEN. The point was to see whether there were present any cases of disloyalty in the State Department, or former employees of the State Department now in other Government departments. I think we have examined every case that comes within those two categories, and I think that was our duty. We want to make a report and file it and go on with other committees to continue the job that is considered necessary.

Senator TYDINGS. Is there any further discussion?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes. Before we vote on this matter, I would like to suggest a "for instance." I am compiling a list right now, which I will have this afternoon and you can have tomorrow afternoon, a list of a substantial number of witnesses to whom the trails in this thing lead.

Senator GREEN. Do they come under those two categories?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes, indeed—associations and connections in the State Department.

Senator GREEN. I think that is going on a fishing expedition. A witness who may know of something in the State Department is one thing, but if you can give us the name of anyone in the State Department on whom there are reasonable grounds for suspecting his disloyalty will be another thing.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. For instance, I would like to make a request at this moment, that Maj. Gen. C. A. Willoughby, Assistant Chief of Staff in G-2, General Headquarters in the Far Eastern Command, under General MacArthur, furnish a review of the sort in the Smedley case, with special reference to their American associations.

Senator TYDINGS. I think, Senator Hickenlooper, without taking issue with you, we could sit here and probably think of a thousand pertinent sidelights, and some of them would be more than sidelights, perhaps.

Senator GREEN. Excuse me, I started to leave. I am afraid I will have to leave in the middle of this.

Senator TYDINGS. Let's have a decision, Senator Green. Your motion is pending. Are you ready for the question?

Senator GREEN. I would like to have a vote on it.

Senator LODGE. That is, to have the counsel prepare a report?

Senator TYDINGS. And submit it to us on the evidence up to date.

Senator McMAHON. That doesn't commit us to anything except seeing a compendium of what we have got.

Senator TYDINGS. You are going to have to do this sometime. You might as well walk up to it now. There never will be a point where you will be finished.

Senator McMAHON. I personally, in voting for this motion, want it understood as meaning in my mind that we are going to have an orderly presentation of the work of the committee to date. When I take a look at that report—I shouldn't call it a report; I should call it a memorandum of work that has been done—it would be very helpful to me in charting what I think should be the future course of the committee.

Senator GREEN. That is my suggestion.

Senator LODGE. Is it your thought that there should be a draft of a final report?

Senator GREEN. To date.



Senator LODGE. I don't like that word "final." I don't think the public will take it as final.

Senator GREEN. A draft to date of the work we have accomplished is what I would like to see. Can we decide we ought to fill in this gap or that gap or decide we ought to do this or follow up something else, so that we can have a definite statement of what we have done up to date?

Senator TYDINGS. My point is this, that we ought to take our hearings as of today, and we ought to have a report drafted for them to see whether we can agree to turn this over to the full committee, with our recommendations about its pursuit of this whole field of operations thereon.

Senator GREEN. We may make a great many changes in the report.

Senator TYDINGS. We wouldn't all agree, we will want this changed and that changed, but we will have to start sometime. I imagine the report will be pretty long. We have got a hundred-and-some people to deal with.

Senator LODGE. Let me say this. I think that I have some basic assumptions about this whole situation, which will not make it possible for me to sign this report.

Senator TYDINGS. I would suggest as an alternative that each man draw his own report and submit it and see where we can meet.

Senator LODGE. I have no objection to the staff working up any kind of a document that they desire, but I want to make it clear that as far as I am concerned, I don't think I will be able to sign it, because my basic assumptions about this whole proceeding are different.

Senator TYDINGS. That is all right. I am willing to start on my report. What I would like to do is get it here and tell you what I am going to say, and if you don't agree with it, make one of your own, but I want a report on the work. I think our work is pretty well concluded, if you want my opinion.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I don't think it has even started, Mr. Chairman.

Senator TYDINGS. You disagree with me?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I disagree with you.

Senator TYDINGS. But I disagree with you, so there we are.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, may I mention just one case here?

Senator TYDINGS. Mr. Morris, we can mention cases from now until doomsday.

Mr. MORRIS. It is in the record, Senator. May I just finish?

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, you are not a member of the committee. When we want counsel to speak, we will ask them, but I am going to let you speak. However, that is a matter for the committee to decide.

Senator LODGE. I would like to hear what he has to say.

Mr. MORRIS. There is a case of a man named Theodore Geiger. He has been an employee of the State Department. He is now one of Paul Hoffman's top assistants. He is doing work that is quasi-State Department in character. I have gone and gotten some witnesses together who will testify that he was a member of the same Communist Party unit as they were, and I think that we would be delinquent if in the face of this evidence that is now on the record—

Senator TYDINGS. Why didn't you tell us this? Why did you wait until this hour to tell me?

Mr. MORRIS. I am not waiting, Senator. One day Senator Green made me a witness and I put it all in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. You haven't told me about it. This is the first I have heard about it.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, I assume that you are aware of everything in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. No. There are some things in the record I haven't been able to read.

Mr. MORRIS. Certainly Mr. Morgan knows it. I have mentioned it several times to him.

Senator GREEN. That wouldn't have anything to do with my motion.

Senator TYDINGS. Turn it over to the FBI or do something else with it. I would like to get a decision here. We don't want to waste this afternoon.

Senator Green has recommended that the counsel prepare a report which will review the work that we have done, and that it may be used as a basis for committee action or individual action upon the matters we have already had under examination. Is that substantially it?

Senator GREEN. That is substantially it, yes.

Senator TYDINGS. Do you want to add to it?

Senator GREEN. No. I accepted that as a basis for conclusions which we may later reach.

Senator McMAHON. Before voting I would like to say that I think it is a profitable thing to do, because we have been in existence now for how long, Mr. Chairman?

Senator TYDINGS. We are going on our fifth month.

Senator McMAHON. Fifth month. I would like to see a review, and in a form that I can very easily digest, of what we have already adduced in the record and, measuring that against our resolution of instructions, to see exactly where, in my mind, we are, and it is for that purpose of being helpful to me that I vote aye on the motion.

Senator TYDINGS. All those in favor will signify by saying "aye."

(Chorus of "ayes.")

Senator TYDINGS. Opposed?

(Chorus of "noes.")

Senator TYDINGS. All those in favor will signify by raising their hands.

(A show of hands.)

Senator McMAHON. Before we finally take a record vote, can I ask the basis of the objection for getting counsel to submit a brief to us? Perhaps I don't understand.

Senator LODGE. I have many basic objections.

Senator McMAHON. It seems to me like a sensible thing to make use of our counsel to give us a brief of what we have already done.

Senator LODGE. In the first place, there is the use of the word "conclusion" or "concluding," which Senator Green inserted into his motion. Senator Green is a man who understands the language and uses it very carefully, as I have had occasion to learn many times from my associations with him. The idea of that word "conclusion" is flatly at variance with my idea that this thing is by no means concluded and will not be concluded until we have a trained bipartisan commission that will make an independent investigation. That is one thing. Sec-

only, my whole basic assumption about this whole situation is so different that I think I would be misconstruing my own position if I were to vote for this particular motion.

Senator GREEN. We must make some sort of a report, must we not?

Senator LODGE. My position is that the thing we ought to do is to report out a resolution, setting up a trained bipartisan commission of experts to make an independent investigation.

Senator GREEN. That may be a conclusion, but we must make a report of what we have done, surely.

Senator TYDINGS. Cabot, what will we do with what we have already done; take it down and turn it over to them without reaching any conclusions?

Senator GREEN. Conclusions are a separate matter. It doesn't have to be a conclusion, not this report. It is just for a basis.

Senator LODGE. A basis for conclusions.

Senator GREEN. In other words, the conclusion might be that we can't reach any definite conclusion. That might be the conclusion we will reach.

Senator LODGE. I think you have got the votes to carry the motion.

Senator TYDINGS. I don't want to carry any motion by sheer force.

Senator McMAHON. I tried to frame what I interpret it to be, a working paper to give me the benefit of what has already been done in this committee period. Now what I do with the working memorandum when I get it and read it is a horse of another color. But I can't see why counsel can't prepare a working memorandum and submit it to us without any vote at all. I am quite willing to vote.

Senator GREEN. I've got to go. It is always a half hour, or another hour, or 2 hours.

Senator TYDINGS. I know, but this may save you two or three more committee meetings, where we would go over the same ground again.

Let me suggest that counsel prepare a tentative report to submit to the members of this committee, that each man prepare, if he wishes, such report as he wants and such recommendations as he wants, and that we pool those here and see if we can reach collectively or individually a basis for bringing our present hearings to a close and passing it on with recommendations for further action.

Senator GREEN. If it would suit Senator Lodge better, I would just call it an interim report.

Senator LODGE. You see, I start in with this basic assumption.

Senator TYDINGS. Would you object to an interim report?

Senator LODGE. I don't object to your telling Mr. Morgan as chief counsel to prepare a summary of the testimony today, if you want to, although to me it wouldn't be a document of much significance.

Senator TYDINGS. What I wanted to do was to find out whether we could tell the country what we found out up to now and then go on from there in any other field we want.

Senator LODGE. Let me answer you this way. My basic assumption is that in 1945, at the end of VE-day, those who were running this Government utterly failed to sense the new realities of the situation; that that showed itself in the fact that no reason was ever given for maintaining our Armed Forces; so that a clamor developed to not just demobilize, but to disintegrate our Armed Forces to a point where we had no influence left. In the case of the State Department, that

revealed itself in this carrying into the service of the State Department 4,000 people from these temporary war agencies, with no screening whatever, many of whom were totally unfit to be in the Government.

Senator GREEN. That all ought to be in the report.

Senator TYDINGS. It is in the report already.

Senator LODGE. That the administration in 1945 totally failed to sense the realities of the world situation.

Senator TYDINGS. Yes, sir, it is all in there.

Senator LODGE. I will be interested to read that.

Senator TYDINGS. It is all in there. We have got a complete explanation of it.

Senator LODGE. I would like to see that report before I vote.

Senator GREEN. Certainly.

Senator LODGE. If it has got that in there it will be interesting.

Senator TYDINGS. There isn't anything that isn't completely open and aboveboard.

Senator McMAHON. I deny that it is in the record, that at the end of the war the administration totally failed—I deny that that is in the record.

Senator LODGE. I thought you would.

Senator McMAHON. I, incidentally, deny the truth of it.

Senator LODGE. I thought you would.

Senator McMAHON. If you want to say it was the administration, say it was the American people, all the American people, everybody in the world, but that is immaterial to this record.

Senator LODGE. Senator, if the leaders of this country had said to the American people that we must maintain our Armed Forces of a certain size and bear a certain relation to the other armed forces in the world, the clamor to demobilize would never have arisen. It was the lack of real leadership. The reason we are in such trouble today is because of that.

Senator TYDINGS. My dear friend, we have got a proposition before us whereby we have been working going on our fifth month. We have assembled a vast amount of evidence about matters that are pertinent to this inquiry and upon which the public ought to be informed. The suggestion before us is that counsel prepare a report on the evidence we have taken up to now. It doesn't necessarily mean that we have to quit there or stop there. We can do whatever we please. But I would like to make a report on what we have done up to now, with recommendations flowing from that about what should be done in the future. Now, could there be any objection to that?

Senator LODGE. I understand that the text has already been drafted of this report; is that right?

Senator TYDINGS. I have asked Mr. Morgan to keep his text as current as he could. He has got a lot of it done. I haven't read it.

Senator LODGE. Why do you need the motion if he is writing it?

Senator TYDINGS. Senator Hickenlooper got one current, and you have got one current. Now let me get this straight. All you have got before you is this: Here is our evidence.

Senator GREEN. What are you arguing for?

Senator TYDINGS. Will you let me make this statement?

Senator GREEN. Yes; certainly.

Senator TYDINGS. Here is our evidence. Why shouldn't we make a finding on the evidence we have got up to now, plus such recommendations as we want to make based on the evidence?

Senator GREEN. I want to get the statement of evidence before I make any findings.

Senator TYDINGS. I am not talking about findings.

Senator GREEN. You just said findings.

Senator TYDINGS. I said we ought to make a report based on the evidence up to now.

Senator GREEN. You said findings.

Senator TYDINGS. Well, do you want to vote on it?

Senator McMAHON. Does that include the 81 down at the White House?

Senator TYDINGS. It looks to be like we are just afraid. What are we afraid about?

Senator LODGE. I am not afraid to make my report.

Senator McMAHON. Nor I mine.

Senator TYDINGS. All those in favor of the Green resolution will signify by saying "aye."

Senator GREEN. Aye.

Senator McMAHON. Aye.

Senator TYDINGS. All those opposed signify by saying "no."

Senator LODGE. No.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. No.

Senator TYDINGS. Two votes no and two the other way.

Go ahead, Mr. Morgan, and prepare your report. The meeting is in recess.

Senator McMAHON. I never saw a committee where the committee did not vote unanimously to have a report of its work brought to its attention.

Senator LODGE. That shows how controversial this subject is.

Mr. MORGAN. Pursuant to the committee's approval of this action, I am at this point incorporating in the record all of the various items which we thus far have collected in the office of the staff.

(These items are included in the appendix to the record at pp. 1756 to 2509.)

(Whereupon, at 3:50 p. m., the committee adjourned.)

0-11 (4-14-55)

2-56

TO: MECHANICAL SECTION  
Prepare the following for

Mr. J. W. Linton

Justice

Mimeograph   
  Photographing   
  Photostating   
 Room **4746**  
 Duplimat   
  Addressograph   
  Multi-lithing   
 Ext. **2301**

No. of Orig. Pages	No. of Copies Each	Description or Remarks	Type of Paper, Size	Neg. or Pos.	Supply on hand plus this order will last
Set out below	1	Part I	8"x10"	Yes	
42	1	Cover page through page 32			
72	1	Page 143 through page 214			
4	1	Page 297 through page 300			
4	1	Page 613 through page 616			
2	1	Page 775 through page 776			
30	1	Page 855 through page 890			
64	1	Page 1421 through page 1484			
Part II					
33	1	Cover page through page 1514			
10	1	Page 1535 through page 1544			
10	1	Page 1725 through page 1734			
12	1	Page 1855 through page 1866			

Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Asst. Dir. Signed *J.M. Linton*

PHOTOGRAPHY - PHOTOSTAT		PRINTING	
	Date	Initials	
Negatives			Run
Positives			Assembled
Contact-Prints			Sorted
Enlargements			Stapled
Lantern Slides			Punched
	Time	Date	Initials
			Cut
Requisition No.			

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 3-19-86 BY 9415 JEL/AG/CAL  
264,098  
SP-7 mac/BB  
6/2/87

5725

FOR MECHANICAL SECTION ONLY

0-11 (4-14-55)

TO: MECHANICAL SECTION

Prepare the following for Mr. L. N. Linton

2-56

2301

Mimeograph   
  Photographing   
  Photostating   
 Room 2301  
 Duplimat   
  Addressograph   
  Multi-lithing   
 Ext. 2301

No. of Orig. Pages	No. of Copies Each	Description or Remarks	Type of Paper, Size	Neg. or Pos.	Supply on hand plus this order will last
12	1	Page 2059 through 2060			
16	1	Page 2123 through 2138			
2	1	Page 2173 through 2174			
48	1	Page 2462 through 2509			
		Part III			
19	1	Cover through page 2525			

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
 HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
 DATE 3-19-86 BY 9163/STG  
 244,079 SP-7 mac/RSB  
 6/2/87

Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Asst. Dir. Signed J.M. Linton

FOR MECHANICAL SECTION ONLY			PHOTOGRAPHY - PHOTOSTAT	PRINTING		
Delivered	Time	Date	Initials		Date	Initials
					Negatives	Run
Positives	Assembled					
Contact-Prints	Folded					
Enlargements	Stapled					
Lantern Slides	Punched					
	Cut					
				Requisition No.		

5365

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

---

---

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

PURSUANT TO

**S. Res. 231**

A RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER THERE ARE  
EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT  
DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES

**PART 1**

---

MARCH 8, 9, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27, 28, APRIL 5, 6, 20, 25, 27, 28,  
MAY 1, 2, 3, 4, 26, 31, JUNE 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 1950

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1950



STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

---

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

PURSUANT TO

S. Res. 231

A RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER THERE ARE  
EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT  
DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES

---

PART 1

MARCH 8, 9, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27, 28, APRIL 5, 6, 20, 25, 27, 28,  
MAY 1, 2, 3, 4, 26, 31, JUNE 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 1950

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

TOM CONNALLY, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia      ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan  
ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah      ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin  
MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland      H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey  
CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida      BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa  
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island      HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts  
BRIEN McMAHON, Connecticut  
J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*  
C. C. O'DAY, *Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SENATE RESOLUTION 231

MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland, *Chairman*

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island      BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa  
BRIEN McMAHON, Connecticut      HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts

EDWARD P. MORGAN, *Chief Counsel*

ROBERT L. HEALD, *Assistant Counsel*      ROBERT MORRIS, *Assistant Counsel*  
WILLIAM J. KLIMA, *Assistant Counsel*      LYON L. TYLER, Jr., *Assistant Counsel*  
MARGARET B. BUCHHOLZ, *Subcommittee Clerk*

## CONTENTS

Testimony of—	Page
Bielaski, Frank Brooks, president of the Research and Security Corporation, New York City.....	923-967
Bess, Demaree, associate editor of the Saturday Evening Post.....	796-797
Browder, Earl Russell.....	669-707
Brunauer, Esther Caukin, Assistant Director for Policy Liaison, UNESCO Relations Staff, State Department.....	293-314
Budenz, Louis Francis, assistant professor of economics at Fordham University.....	487-558
Dodd, Dr. Bella V., attorney, New York City.....	631-659
Field, Frederick Vanderbilt.....	709-735
Ford, Peyton, assistant to the Attorney General.....	1054
Hanson, Haldore, chief of technical cooperation projects staff, State Department.....	341-371, 1179-1180
Heald, Robert L., assistant counsel, Foreign Relations Subcommittee.....	1206-1207
Hitchcock, Robert M., attorney, Buffalo, N. Y.....	1001-1051
Holmes, Gen. Julius C., Foreign Service officer, assigned as Minister, in London.....	1165-1178
Hoover, J. Edgar, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	326-339
Jaffe, Philip J., former editor of Amerasia magazine.....	1213-1227
Jessup, Philip C., Ambassador at Large, State Department.....	215-275
Kenyon, Dorothy, attorney, New York City.....	176-214
Kerley, Larry E., reporter, New York Journal American.....	660-667
Ladd, D. Milton, assistant to the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	1053-1074
Larsen, Emmanuel S., former employee of State Department.....	1075-1123, 1125-1164
Lattimore, Owen, director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University.....	417-486, 799-871, 873-921
McCarthy, Senator Joseph R.....	1-32, 33-72, 73-108, 109-175, 277-292
McGrath, J. Howard, the Attorney General.....	315-326
McInerney, James M., Assistant Attorney General in Charge of the Criminal Division, Department of Justice.....	971-999, 1001-1051, 1053-1074
Morris, Robert, assistant counsel, Foreign Relations Subcommittee.....	967-970
Nichols, L. B., Assistant Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	1053-1074
Nicholson, Donald L., Chief of the Division of Security, State Department.....	373-390
Peurifoy, John E., Deputy Under Secretary of State, in Charge of Administration.....	1229-1256
Richardson, Seth W., Chairman, Civil Service Loyalty Review Board.....	405-416
Service, John S., Foreign Service officer, State Department.....	1257-1349, 1351-1390, 1391-1453
Snow, Gen. Conrad E., Chairman, Loyalty and Security Board, State Department.....	391-404
Thorpe, Brig. Gen. Elliott R., United States Army, retired.....	558-568
Tyler, Lyon L., Jr., assistant counsel, Foreign Relations Subcommittee.....	1206-1210
Utley, Freda, author.....	737-796
Van Beuren, Archbold, former Director of Security, OSS.....	1185-1206
Vardaman, James K., member of Federal Reserve Board.....	1181-1184

## SCHEDULE OF EXHIBITS

Number and summary of exhibits	Intro- duced at page—	Appears on page—
1. Protest in Daily Worker, Veterans of Abraham Lincoln Brigade	18	1485
2. Letterhead, National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.	20	1486
3. This exhibit was not received by reporter but was described by Senator McCarthy as "a cordial invitation to attend a dinner and presentation of the first annual award of the American-Russian Institute to President Franklin Roosevelt for 'Furthering American-Soviet Relations'" (transcript, p. 26)	26	1487
4. Letterhead, Conference on Pan-American Democracy	31	1487
5. Letterhead, Political Prisoners Bail Fund Committee	66	1488
6. Open letter to the New York Times, Schappes Defense Committee	67	1488
7. Daily Worker, February 10, 1938, Isaac's Stand on Gerson	69	1493
8. Letterhead, League of Women Shoppers	70	1494
9. Letterhead, American Committee for Anti-Nazi Literature	71	1495
10. Letterhead and Attachment, American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom	71	1495
11. Letterhead, Citizens Committee to Aid Striking Seamen	71	1498
12. Letterhead, Film Audiences for Democracy	71	1499
13. List of officers and advertising board of Films for Democracy	71	1499
14. Program, Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights	71	1500
15. Open letter to the New York Times supporting Communist cause in Spain	71	1504
16. Letterhead, Lawyers Committee on American Relations with Spain	72	1506
17. Letterhead, Milk-Consumers Protective Committee	72	1507
18. Statement of Senator McCarthy on Haldore Hanson	75	1508
19. State Department departmental announcement No. 41	75	1512
20. McCarthy's statement on Esther Cankin Brunauer	83	1514
21. Program of Washington meeting of the American Friends of the Soviet Union	83	1514
22. Call of the American Youth Congress in 1938	86	1515
23. The American Union for Coordinated Peace Efforts	91	1518
24. The New York Times' release on The American Union for Coordinated Peace Efforts	91	1519
25. Proceedings Congress of Youth	91	1520
26. Senator McCarthy's statement on Owen Lattimore	92	1523
27. Letterhead of Amerasia magazine	92	1532
28. Times Herald of June 6, 1946, How Come by Frank C. Waldrop	93	1532
29. Invitation for Membership, Institute of Pacific Relations	100	1534
30. Program, National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights	103	1535
31. Writers Congress, 1943 program and list	104	1536
32. Senator McCarthy's statement on Gustavo Duran	110	1542
33. Spruille Braden's letter, dated Havana, December 21, 1943	120	1548
34. Intelligence report by Edward J. Ruff	122	1548
35. Senator McCarthy's statement on John S. Service	130	1549
36. Letterhead, Testimonial to Ellis Island Hunger Strikers	144	144
37. Letterhead, China Aid Counsel of American League for Peace and Democracy	144	145
38. Letterhead, African Aid Committee	144	145
39. Call to a national conference on American policy in China and the Far East	144	147
40. Summons to a congress on Civil Rights	144	150
41. Statement of American educators	144	154
42. Invitation to a dinner for Henry A. Wallace in New York, Sept. 12, 1949	144	157
43. Statement calling for reinstatement of University of Washington professors	144	159

CONTENTS

v

SCHEDULE OF EXHIBITS—Continued

Number and summary of exhibits	Intro- duced at page—	Appears on page—
44. Advertisement for Culture and the Crisis, League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford.....	144	160
45. List of officers and members of the National Citizens Political Action Committee.....	144	160
46. Daily Worker, Apr. 16, 1947, Notables Defend Communists' Rights.....	144	165
47. Press release of National Wallace-for-President Committee.....	144	166
48. The text of an open letter calling for greater unity of the anti-Fascist forces.....	144	167
49. Clipping from Daily News, Feb. 14, 1940, Plot To Wreck Labor Party Exposed.....	177	1555
50. Dorothy Kenyon's letter to Alex Rose, State secretary, American Labor Party, dated Oct. 10, 1939.....	183	1557
51. New York Times, May 26, 1941, open letter to President Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies.....	184	1558
52. Voice of America radio monitor of Russian broadcasting, Russia Has Freest Women On Earth.....	187	1560
53. Letter in New York Times, Feb. 16, 1946, Columbia Professors Ask Declaration To Aid UNO Commission.....	268	1561
54. Dr. Jessup's letter, Mar. 24, 1950, with attached list of individuals at round table discussion in Department of State, Oct. 6, 7, and 8, 1949.....	293	1561
55. List of Esther Caukin Brunauer's publications.....	297	1562
56. Esther Caukin Brunauer presents testimonial letters.....	299	1563
57. Letter from American Association of University Women to Senator Tydings.....	311	1582
58. Statement of duties of Haldore Hanson with the Department of State 1942 to date.....	371	1584
59. Text of Hanson letter to Senator Tydings, Mar. 24, 1950.....	371	1587
60. Chart, Chain of command for personnel security.....	375	1589
61. Chart, enforcing the President's loyalty program.....	370	1590
62. Chart, screening civil-service applicants (since October 1947).....	378	1591
63. Chart, screening non-civil-service and Foreign Service applicants.....	381	1592
64. Chart, eliminating security risks.....	382	1593
65. Chart, composition of Loyalty and Security Board, Department of State.....	383	1594
66. Chart, State Department Loyalty and Security Board, procedures for handling cases.....	383	1595
67. Biographical notes on members of State Department Loyalty Board.....	392	1596
68. Letter to President Roosevelt from Chiang Kai-shek, Jan. 12, 1942, re: Owen Lattimore.....	422	1602
69. Minutes of fourth meeting of Arctic Research Laboratory Advisory Board, May 17, 18, 19, 1949.....	423	1603
70. An analysis of Mr. Alfred E. Kobilberg's charges against the Institute of Pacific Relations.....	425	1612
71. Comparison of McCarthy's and Kobilberg's charges.....	425	1641
72. Program, a Conference on Democratic Rights, June 14, 15, 1940, at Baltimore, Md.....	432	1646
73. Excerpts from letters and telegrams from scholars with a professional knowledge of Owen Lattimore's work.....	437	1648
74. Disaster in China by James F. Kearney, Columbia, September 1949.....	499	1660
75. China's Communists Told Me by Philip J. Jaffe, October 12, 1937.....	499	1665
76. China's Part in the Coalition War by T. A. Bisson, June 7, 1944.....	499	1670
77. Draft of Louis F. Budenz' article for Collier's magazine.....	508	1677
78. Daily Worker, April 29, 1949, Situation in Asia, by Owen Lattimore.....	521	1683

## SCHEDULE OF EXHIBITS—Continued

Number and summary of exhibits	Introduced at page—	Appears on page—
79. Group of testimonial letters re Dr. Dodd.....	636	1685
80. New York Herald Tribune, Double Trouble in Asia.....	763	1689
81. Letter to Senator Tydings from Demaree Bess, April 7, 1950.	797	1689
82. Telegram from Edith Chamberlain Field to Mr. Abe Fortas, April 26, 1950.....	803	1691
83. Transcript of hearing re John Santo.....	812	1691
84. List of contributors to Pacific Affairs March 1934 to June 1941.	817	1725
85. Signers of letters from people who know Owen Lattimore's work.....	825	1730
86. Minutes of meeting of Fighting Funds for Finland, Inc. February 20, 1940.....	832	1733
87. Quotations from Owen Lattimore's writings.....	880	1734
88. Attack on Owen Lattimore in Communist Press, April 1949..	881	1735
89. Emmanuel S. Larsen's draft of Plain Talk Article.....	1118	1739
90. Brooks Atkinson's article in New York Times, October 31, 1944.....	1290	1753

## SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

	Page
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from Austin W. Wood, vice president and general manager of the News Publishing Co., Wheeling, W. Va., dated March 25, 1950, relative to newspaper account of Wheeling speech of Senator McCarthy.....	1756
Clippings from the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, Friday, February 10, 1950, concerning McCarthy's charges that Reds hold United States Jobs.....	1756
Clipping from the Nevada State Journal (Reno, Nev.) February 12, 1950, McCarthy Blasts State Department.....	1757
Affidavit of Paul A. Myers, as program director of radio station WWVA dated April 25, 1950, relative to tape recording of Wheeling speech of Senator McCarthy.....	1758
Tape recording of Senator Joseph McCarthy's speech given on February 9, 1950, at Wheeling, W. Va.....	1759
Affidavit of James K. Whitaker, as news editor of radio station WWVA dated April 25, 1950, relative to tape recording of Wheeling speech of Senator McCarthy.....	1763
Tape recording of Senator McCarthy's speech given on February 9, 1950, at Wheeling, W. Va.....	1763
Subpena to Dean H. Acheson, Secretary of State, Department of State, to appear before the subcommittee established by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States on April 4, 1950, at 10:30 a. m.....	1767
Subpena to J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General, to appear before the subcommittee established by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States on April 4, 1950, at 10:30 a. m.....	1768
Subpena to Harry B. Mitchell, Chairman, Civil Service Commission, to appear before the subcommittee established by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States on April 4, 1950, at 10:30 a. m.....	1769
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from Peyton Ford, Deputy Attorney General, dated June 16, 1950, contained list of State Department files made available to the subcommittee.....	1770
Memoranda concerning data extracted from the State Department loyalty files relative to 108 individuals. These memoranda were prepared in 1947 by investigators for a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations of the Eightieth Congress. These individuals are identified only by numbers.....	1771
Employment data on persons mentioned by Senator McCarthy during appearances before the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor of the Senate.....	1813

## SUPPLEMENTAL DATA—Continued

	Page
Letter to Hon. Millard Tydings from John E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary, dated June 19, 1950, enclosing the following State Department press releases, which are set out in full thereafter.....	1818
Press release No. 491, May 12, 1950, State Department analysis of Senator McCarthy's speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors.....	1818
Press release No. 501, May 15, 1950. State Department's analysis of Senator McCarthy's speech at Atlantic City.....	1825
Press release No. 529, May 20, 1950. State Department's analysis of Senator McCarthy's speech at Chicago.....	1826
Press release No. 549, May 25, 1950. State Department's analysis of some of the factual inaccuracies in the speech delivered by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy at Atlantic City, May 15, 1950, to the Sons of the American Revolution.....	1834
Press release No. 553, May 26, 1950. State Department's comment on Senator McCarthy's speech at Rochester, N. Y.....	1840
Press release No. 558, May 27, 1950. Department of State's analysis of some of the factual inaccuracies in the speech delivered by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy at Rochester, N. Y., on May 25, 1950, to the National Convention of the Catholic Press Association of the United States.....	1841
Press release No. 614, June 9, 1950. Department of State's comment on Senator McCarthy's statement that a photostat he produced on the Senate floor June 6, constituted proof that three men individually listed by the FBI as Communist agents in 1946 are still working in the Department.....	1845
Memorandum No. 19, September 21, 1948—to all executive departments and agencies from Seth W. Richardson, Chairman, Loyalty Review Board. Subject: Classification according to section 3, part III, of E. O. 9835 of organizations previously designated by the Attorney General as within the purview of the Executive order.....	1848
Memorandum No. 43, April 25, 1949—to all executive departments and agencies from Seth W. Richardson, Chairman, Loyalty Review Board. Subject: Attorney General's letter of April 21, 1949, listing additional organizations designated under and classified in accordance with section 3, part III of Executive Order 9835.....	1851
Memorandum No. 44, July 21, 1949—to all executive departments and agencies from Seth W. Richardson, Chairman, Loyalty Review Board. Subject: Certain organizations and groups connected with organizations previously designated and classified by the Attorney General under section 3, part III of Executive Order 9835.....	1853
Memorandum No. 49, September 27, 1949—to all executive departments and agencies from Seth W. Richardson, Chairman, Loyalty Review Board. Subject: Attorney General's letter of September 26, 1949, concerning change in name of an organization designated and classified under section 3, part III of Executive Order 9835.....	1853
Letter to Robert L. Heald, assistant counsel, Foreign Relations Subcommittee, from Conrad E. Snow, Chairman, Loyalty Security Board, dated June 23, 1950, setting out current statistics on loyalty program.....	1854
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from Stephen Brunauer, dated May 8, 1950. Enclosed was (1) a statement which Brunauer wrote about himself; and (2) a file of testimonial letters—with a copy of his request for the letters; and (3) a copy of the statement about Brunauer which was released by the Navy Department on March 13, 1950.....	1855
Letter to Hon. Millard Tydings from John E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary, dated July 6, 1950, relative to appointment of Dr. Harlow Shapley.....	1864
Letter to Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, from Gustavo Duran, enclosing an affidavit dated May 10, 1950.....	1865
Letter to Mr. Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, from Harlow Shapley, dated May 9, 1950, enclosing copies of two statements issued publicly by him, dated April 7 and 22, 1950....	1870
Letter to Mr. Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, from Frederick L. Schuman dated May 9, 1950.....	1873

## SUPPLEMENTAL DATA--Continued

	Page
Letter to Mr. Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, from Mary Jane Keeney, dated May 15, 1950.....	1874
Two letters to Mr. Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, from Louis Francis Budenz dated May 3 and 5, 1950.....	1874
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from Peyton Ford, Deputy Attorney General dated June 22, 1950, relative to Father Kearney.....	1876
Letter to Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, from James M. McInerney, Assistant Attorney General, dated May 26, 1950, relative to testimony of Mr. Budenz.....	1876
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from Carlisle H. Humelsine, Acting Deputy Under Secretary, dated July 3, 1950, relative to Mr. Haldore Hanson.....	1877
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from W. L. Holland dated April 15, 1950, enclosing alphabetical list of names of the people that signed a statement concerning Owen Lattimore's character, loyalty, etc.....	1877
Letter to Mr. Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, from Paul A. Porter, dated May 11, 1950, enclosing copies of Owen Lattimore's correspondence to the Soviet Ambassador and the Chief of State of the Mongolian People's Republic in 1947, as well as copies of correspondence with Dr. Walther Heissig.....	1879
Letter to Mr. Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, from Adrian S. Fisher, the legal adviser of the Department of State dated June 22, 1950, concerning the part of the State Department had in financing three Mongolian scholars at Johns Hopkins University, enclosing copy of the contract of agreement between United States and Johns Hopkins University.....	1892
Letter from Department of Justice to Senator Tydings concerning affidavits turned over to the FBI by Senator McCarthy.....	1895
Material inserted in the record at the request of Mrs. Freda Utley.....	1897
Chronology of events furnished the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee by Mr. Charles Edward Rhetts, attorney for John S. Service.....	1902
Two letters to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from C. E. Rhetts, attorney for John S. Service, dated June 27, 1950, concerning press item on Admiral Nimitz and information relative to statements of General Hurley.....	1905
A carbon copy of the memorandum, The Stilwell Affair and Hurley's Appointment, recovered in the offices of Amerasia.....	1912
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from Peyton Ford, Deputy Attorney General, dated June 19, 1950, stating that the document referred to by Senator McCarthy on June 7, 1950, was not prepared by the FBI.....	1913
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from John E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary dated June 28, 1950, enclosing copies of the Department's press releases of June 6 and June 9, 1950.....	1914
Letter to Hon. James E. Webb, Under Secretary of State, from John Edgar Hoover, Director, FBI, dated June 14, 1950, wherein Mr. Hoover stated that the comments made by Mr. Samuel Klaus, of Mr. Webb's Department, in his report concerning the alleged FBI chart as appeared in the newspapers, were completely erroneous.....	1915
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from Peyton Ford, Deputy Attorney General dated June 13, 1950, giving information as to the dates of various searches made by the agents of FBI of the offices of Amerasia and the residences of the subjects in the case.....	1915
Office memorandum to Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, from D. M. Ladd, dated April 18, 1945, relative to FBI conferences with the State and Navy Departments on the Amerasia Case.....	1916
Letter to Mr. Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, from Mathias F. Correa dated June 13, 1950, on behalf of the executors of the estate, submitting a photographic copy of a portion of Mr. Forrestal's personal papers together with an affidavit of Eugene S. Duffield who has custody of various of Mr. Forrestal's personal papers at the present time.....	1916
The staff of the subcommittee submitted memoranda on interviews with the following persons: Joseph W. Ballentine (May 19, 1950), Robert Bannerman (May 22, 1950), William J. Donovan (May 25, 1950), Frederick B. Lyon (May 17, 1950) and Judge Proctor (May 10, 1950).....	1917
Information developed by the staff of the subcommittee on persons believed to be Washington contacts of Philip Jacob Jaffe.....	1920



## SUPPLEMENTAL DATA—Continued

	Page
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from Francis P. Matthews, Department of Navy, dated June 26, 1950, relative to Lt. Andrew Roth.....	1923
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from Peyton Ford, the assistant to the Attorney General, dated May 16, 1950, stating that a copy of the transcript of grand jury proceedings in the case <i>United States v. Philip J. Jaffe</i> would be available to the Subcommittee at the Department of Justice.....	1924
Letter to Millard E. Tydings from James M. McInerney, Department of Justice, dated May 10, 1950, enclosing a photostatic copy of the Demurrer, motion to quash, and motion to suppress evidence also a newspaper article which appeared in the September 28, 1945 issue of the Evening Star entitled "Larsen Charges FBI Made Illegal Search of Home for United States Files".....	1924
A certified record of official court reporter of proceedings before Justice Proctor on September 29, 1945, <i>Case of United States v. Philip Jacob Jaffe</i> .....	1933
A certified record of official court reporter of proceedings before Justice Proctor on November 2, 1945, <i>Case of United States v. Emmanuel S. Larsen</i> .....	1937
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from Peyton Ford, Deputy Attorney General, dated June 19, 1950, relative to corporate status of Amerasia.....	1939
Letter to Mr. James J. McInerney, Assistant Attorney General, from Rev. Robert C. Hartnett, S. J., Editor of America, dated June 26, 1950, enclosing a clipping of Mr. McInerney's letter as it appeared in America for July 1, in regard to documents in the Amerasia case.....	1940
Letter to Mr. Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee from James M. McInerney, Assistant Attorney General, dated June 29, 1950, enclosing a mimeographed copy of the presentment returned and filed by the special grand jury in the southern district of New York on June 15, 1950.....	1941
Medical certificate from Luke Berardi, M. D., of Mount Vernon, N. Y., dated May 12, 1950, relative to John Huber.....	1945
Letter to Hon. Millard E. Tydings from William Foster, Acting Administrator, ECA, concerning Theodore Geiger's loyalty, dated July 5, 1950.....	1945
Incorporation by reference of a portion of the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate held March 23, 1948.....	1945
Incorporation by reference of the record of hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Eightieth Congress, second session, held March 10 and 12, 1948.....	1945
Incorporation by reference of a portion, being pages 169 through 210 and 206 through 210, of the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, Eightieth Congress, second session, held January 28, 1948.....	1945
Incorporation by reference of the speech made on the floor of the House, August 2, 1948 by Congressman Jonkman, entitled "Department of State" which appears in the Congressional Record for that date at page 9793.....	1945
Letter to Mr. Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, from Adrian S. Fisher, the legal adviser from the Department of State dated July 10, 1950; enclosing a copy of Public Law 535 and a departmental announcement No. 41.....	1946
Transcript of proceedings of the Loyalty Security Board meeting in the case of John S. Service.....	1958

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE  
LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTED UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 231,  
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a. m. in room 318, Senate Office Building, Senator Millard E. Tydings (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Tydings (chairman of the subcommittee), Green, McMahon, Hickenlooper, and Lodge.

Also present: Senators Connally (chairman of the full committee) and McCarthy.

Senator TYDINGS. The committee will come to order.

I think it appropriate first that the record show why this committee is meeting and what its scope and purpose is to be in these proceedings. Senate Resolution 231, introduced by Mr. Lucas, was considered, amended, and agreed to on February 22, 1950. The resolution reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are, or have been, employed by the Department of State. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the result of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable, and if said recommendations are to include formal charges of disloyalty against any individual, then the committee, before making said recommendation, shall give said individual open hearing for the purpose of taking evidence or testimony on said charges.

In the conduct of this study and investigation, the committee is directed to procure by subpoena and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State, and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard.

The resolution was adopted by the Senate because of certain statements made on the floor of the Senate, on Monday, February 20, 1950, and Wednesday, February 22, 1950.

In order that the committee may have all of the evidence that it should properly consider available in the record, the chairman has had the pages dealing with the information and charges and debate on these 2 days culled from the Congressional Record and, without objection, at this point the proceedings of the Senate dealing with this matter will be incorporated by reference in the record. Is there any objection? (None.) They will be incorporated by reference in the record.

(The material from the Congressional Record incorporated by reference is as follows:)

Pages 2043-2071, February 20, 1950.

Pages 2104-2110, February 21, 1950.

Pages 2168-2169, 2173-2195, February 22, 1950.

Daily Digest, February 27, 1950.

Pages 2485-2486, 2523-2524, February 28, 1950.

Page 2678, March 2, 1950.

Senator TYDINGS. In the course of these congressional deliberations, Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin, made certain statements in, I believe 81 different cases, and gave a short account of why he thought each of the cases questioned the loyalty of the individual in each case. Senator McCarthy has been invited by the committee to come before us today as our first witness.

I am sure, Senator, that you yourself realize that the individuals who are charged with disloyalty to our Government are confronted with one of the most serious charges that can be leveled at a patriotic or other individual.

Senator McCARTHY. Especially the "or other."

Senator TYDINGS. If these men are guilty of these charges, the committee would want to find it out. If they are not guilty, we will want to inform the public accordingly.

Unless the chairman is overruled, all witnesses coming before this committee will be sworn. In your own case, as a Member of the Senate, the chairman is not going to compel you against your will to submit to be sworn, but I would like to ask you now if you would consent to be sworn.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is an excellent idea to swear all witnesses. I do not think we should have anyone take advantage of any immunity, whether it is a Senator, Secretary of State, or what, so I would like to be sworn.

Senator TYDINGS. I am glad you said that, Senator. That is the way I feel about it. I think we all ought to feel that way. If you will hold up your hand, I will proceed to swear you.

Do you promise that the evidence you shall give in the pending matter before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Senator McCARTHY. I do.

Senator TYDINGS. Now, Senator McCarthy, the information you presented to the Senate has been read by all of us, I am sure. You will want to supplement that, no doubt, and comment further on it.

Senator McCARTHY. That is correct.

Senator TYDINGS. But, before you do, there is one matter that, to make the record complete as of the congressional debate, I would like to ask you about for just a minute.

If you will turn to case 14, that you mentioned in the Record—

Senator McCARTHY. Do you know what page that is on, Mr. Chairman?

Senator TYDINGS. I will try to find it in a minute.

Case 14 is in the Congressional Record of February 20, 1950, page 2051, column 3, and page 2052, column 1. I would like to read this particular case to ask you a question dealing with the other 81 cases.

Senator McCARTHY. Certainly.

Senator TYDINGS. I am quoting your remarks:

Case 14: This is a case of pressure from a high State Department official to obtain security clearance for an individual with a bad background from the standpoint of security. He was appointed in December 1945 as a translator in the State Department. This is an interesting case, showing the extent to which some of their superior officers will go when they find that some of these very unusual individuals are going to lose their jobs. He was appointed in December 1945 as a translator in the State Department. A report from another Government investigating agency, under date of January 9, 1946, advised that the subject should be dismissed as a bad security risk because he was flagrantly homosexual. He had extremely close connections with other individuals with the same tendencies and who were active members of Communist front organizations, including the Young Communist League.

I think this is interesting, Mr. President. I asked one of our top intelligence men in Washington one day, "Why do you find men who are so fanatically Communist? Is there something about the Communist philosophy that attracts them?"

He said, "Senator McCarthy, if you had been in this work as long as we have been, you would realize that there is something wrong with each one of these individuals. You will find that practically every active Communist is twisted mentally or physically in some way."

Senator McCARTHY. Let me interrupt you there, Mr. Chairman. The "or physically" should not be in there. I was quoting accurately. I do not agree with the "or physically." I think a vast number of people have physical defects. I have some myself. I do not think that makes a Communist. Let's make that clear. I wanted to make that clear as we go through it.

Senator TYDINGS. It is reported in the Record. I have read the Record as it is reported.

The State Department's own security agency recommended the discharge of this employee on January 22, 1946.

Now this is the part to which I would like to draw your attention. I will repeat that.

The State Department's own security agency recommended the discharge of this employee on January 22, 1946. On February 19, 1946, this individual's services were terminated with the State Department. Subsequently, on April 1, 1946, the action discharging this individual was rescinded and he was reinstated in his job in the State Department. In this case a CSA report of September 2, 1947, is replete with information covering—

and this is the point—

the attempt of a high State Department official to induce several individuals who had signed affidavits reflecting adversely upon the employee to repudiate their affidavits. The file shows that that high State Department employee even went out and personally contacted the individuals who signed the affidavits and asked them, "Won't you repudiate them?"

This individual, according to the security files of the State Department was a very close associate of active Soviet agents. As to whether he is in the State Department at this time or not I frankly do not know, but in view of the fact that he was reinstated, I assume that he is.

Now, the purpose of reading that is this. Is this man who was in the State Department, this high State Department official whom you allege tried to doctor the records, one of the cases of the 81 that you brought before the Senate, or have you referred to him here only to substantiate the facts in case 14?

Senator McCARTHY. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that you will have to let me go through these cases as I have them documented, and we will get to that case. I think we will have to wait until we get

to that case, and I can assure you we will get to it. I have other cases documented for your information this morning. I am going to ask the committee to do this, if I may. As I discuss one case, let's try and stick to that case, and I assure you we will get to all of them without any trouble at all. I will be unable to jump, say, from case 1 to case 72 back to case 58. As of this time I can assure the Chairman that all the information which he wants on case No. 57 will be gotten to him, but I frankly cannot give him that information now, because I haven't arrived at that case this morning. I am sure we won't get to that case this morning.

Senator TYDINGS. Just a minute. Just a minute. Just a minute! All I am asking you is this. This is a very serious charge—

Senator McCARTHY. Very serious.

Senator TYDINGS. That a high official in the State Department is tampering with the records to protect people who are charged with disloyal activities.

Senator McCARTHY. That is right.

Senator TYDINGS. What I would like to know is this: Is he one of the cases that you are going to bring before this committee, or is he just incidental in this case? You can certainly tell me that.

Senator McCARTHY. I will bring his name before the committee and give the committee all the information.

Senator LODGE. I would like to express the hope that Senator McCarthy will get the courtesy everyone gets, of being able to make his own statement in his own way, and then be subject to questioning.

Senator TYDINGS. The only reason I am bringing this out now is, we want to hear Senator McCarthy. We have put this all in the record. I have read over all of these cases three or four times, and studied the possible ramifications of them. I would like to know whether we are to hear this as a collateral matter of proving case 14, or whether this man himself is to be charged with disloyal conduct as a separate case. You can certainly answer that, and then we can leave it.

Senator McCARTHY. I will answer that. I will give the committee all of the information which I have. If the committee decides this man is disloyal, all right. If they decide not, it is up to the committee. There will be no information held back from the committee, and I want to thank the Senator from Massachusetts very much. I would like to be allowed to proceed and present the information in an orderly fashion, and the committee can be sure that any questions they have to ask will certainly be answered. I will answer that question, Senator, that you will be given all the information on the case.

Senator TYDINGS. Let me ask the questions, Senator McCarthy. I am at least charged with the responsibility of conducting this hearing, and I prefer to conduct it as I want it conducted and as the committee wants it conducted, rather than to have you tell me how to conduct it. I will be glad, and we will give you full and free opportunity to present anything you want to present.

All I am asking you now is, do you know the name—I do not want you to tell it—but do you know the name of this particular high State Department official who is allegedly aiding disloyal persons in the State Department? Do you know the name?

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, when we get to case No. 57 I will give you all of the names in that case. No names will be held back.

There are any number of names. I frankly cannot remember the vast number of names.

Senator TYDINGS. You know whether you know the name or not, and you can answer "Yes" or "No" and we can end this right here.

Senator LODGE. I do not think we ought to put the witness in the position of answering "Yes" or "No." I think he has a right to develop his own statement in his own way, and then be subject to questioning, which is a normal procedure here.

Senator TYDINGS. I would like to ask him now, Do you or do you not know the name of this high official in the State Department who allegedly committed the very thing that I have read?

Senator McCARTHY. Senator, I can go back to my office and dig up the name. I am not prepared to testify in case No. 57 this morning. I was sure we would not get to case No. 57. When we get to it, the Senator will have all of the information which I have. I assure him of that. And I hope that then he takes advantage of that and completes the investigation.

Senator TYDINGS. Senator McCarthy, if you will listen to me a moment, I think you and I probably can arrive at an understanding.

Senator McCARTHY. I am sure we can.

Senator TYDINGS. You have made on the floor of the Senate statements concerning 81 individuals. That is all right. The reason I am interested in this case particularly is that in no other case that I recall, and I read them all several times, is there any allegation that any high official in the State Department is covering up disloyal activities or disloyal persons. This was the only case where that happened.

Now if we have such an individual in the State Department, and we may have—I don't know whether we have or not—the most important thing this committee could do right away to clean out any subversive elements in the State Department is to find out who this man is, and we don't want you to give his name in public, but find out who he is and get him out of there. We don't want to wait until case 57 or 86 or next week. We certainly don't want somebody high up in the State Department who is shielding disloyal persons, fixing their records and asking people to withdraw their comments.

Now if this were just an ordinary matter of one individual, that would be one thing. But I cannot think of anything more important in this whole hearing. Maybe this is true or false, I don't know. But I would like to know if you know the name of this man. Then we will go on and let you testify.

Senator McCARTHY. A very good question, Mr. Chairman, and I tried to explain to you that I cannot give you information now on case No. 57.

Senator TYDINGS. I said case 14.

Senator McCARTHY. Let me answer when you ask a question, please.

Let me add this, too. If you are eager to get to that case today, when the testimony ends this morning if you will come to my office I will dig that case out and give you all the names in the file, all the information you want. I cannot give you testimony on case No. 57 because I have prepared cases which I think are more important. I hope the committee will try and take the information which I have. I have it available for you. As I say, if the chairman feels that case No. 57 is urgent, he can come right over to my office as soon as we get

through and he and the reporter can take all of the information on case No. 57, but that is all I can tell you on that now.

Senator TYDINGS. Senator McCarthy, we do not want to go to your office. We are conducting a hearing.

Senator McCARTHY. You will have to wait, then, until I get the information over here, Mr. Chairman.

Senator TYDINGS. You are in the position of being the man who occasioned this hearing, and so far as I am concerned in this committee you are going to get one of the most complete investigations ever given in the history of this Republic, so far as my abilities will permit.

Now what I am asking you now is, Do you or do you not now know the name of this man? Don't tell me. Do you now know it?

Senator McCARTHY. At this particular moment, Mr. Chairman, I could not give you the names of half of these.

Senator TYDINGS. I did not ask you if you could give me the names. I asked you if you knew this name.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot give you any information on case 57. Have I made that clear? Case No. 57 will be developed and you will get all the information, every name that is in this file, when I get to that case.

Senator LODGE. Mr. Chairman, this is the most unusual procedure I have seen in all the years I have been here. Why cannot the Senator from Wisconsin get the normal treatment and be allowed to make his statement in his own way, and not be cross questioned like this before he has had a chance to present what he has?

Senator TYDINGS. If the Senator from Massachusetts will listen to me, what I have already put in the record are the 81 cases that the Senator from Wisconsin brought to the attention of the Senate and the country on the Senate floor. Now I asked him first whether this particular individual was one of the 81 cases. He did not seem able to tell me that, although I thought it was the most important allegation of disloyalty in the whole 81 cases.

I then, in order to bring it down into focus, asked him if he could tell me the name of this man. I did not want him to tell me here in the open, but I wanted to know if he knew it, because it seemed to me to be a rather odd situation that here, out of all these cases, was a high official of the State Department who was attempting to falsify records, suppress evidence, and protect disloyal persons, and no charge of a separate case, so far as I could find, was made out against him as one of the things we should investigate. So before leaving these 81 cases which I have put in the record this thing attracted my attention, and simply before we closed the Senate part of these hearings I am asking the Senator, Is this man known to him so that he can give us his name?

If that is not a reasonable request, he can say "Yes" or "No" or "I will go get it for you and in executive session I will give it to you."

Senator LODGE. I think it is a perfectly reasonable request, Mr. Chairman, at the proper time.

I think it is the most important request that will be made on this question, but I think this is the wrong time to make it. I think the Senator from Wisconsin ought to have the courtesy that every Senator and every witness has, of making his own presentation in his own way and not to be pulled to pieces before he has had a chance to utter one single consecutive sentence.

Senator GREEN. It seems to me that it is important to proceed in this unusual manner, not only for the reason stated by the chairman but for this reason: We may be asked to call upon the State Department to produce papers or evidence. It may be this very man to whom that might be left. If there is such an individual in the State Department suppressing information, distorting facts, we ought to tend to that before we ask the State Department for any papers.

Senator LODGE. Of course we ought to know it, Senator Green.

Senator GREEN. The question is whether the witness knows the name or whether it was imaginary.

Senator LODGE. We ought to know that man's name; we ought to know the names of all these people in here. All I say is that every witness, whether he is a Senator or whether he is not a Senator, is entitled to make his statement in his own words, and not, the minute he sits down, be subjected to a whole lot of piece-meal questioning, thereby making it impossible for him to make his presentation. I think it is just common courtesy and fairness to let a man make his presentation.

Senator TYDINGS. We will give him all the chance in the world to make his statement, if he will simply say he doesn't know the name of the man or he does know the name of the man. Certainly he can tell us whether he knows the name or does not know it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, why is it so vital at this original jump-off meeting of this committee to know the name of an individual man, when the witness says in due course and in the course of his presentation he will give and disclose to this committee those names? It would seem to me that Senator McCarthy ought to be permitted to present his charges, his allegations, his information, and then this committee can look into them and evaluate which is the most important to first go into.

Senator GREEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may answer my distinguished colleague's argument, it is this, that if we are going into the files of the State Department, we ought to have confidence that they are not furnished or handled by an individual against whom such a charge is made as that he is a high officer in the State Department using his power improperly, because the testimony which we may need may come through him, and therefore we ought to clear the decks before we proceed. Not only that, but if these charges are true, that man still has access to the files in the meantime. That is my point.

Senator LODGE. If it were essential to do this so soon, why wasn't it done the minute Senator McCarthy made his speech on the Senate floor? Why did we wait until this particular moment?

Senator TYDINGS. Let me say this: I have no desire to delay Senator McCarthy. I am anxious for him to get on. My first question was, Is this individual who is accused of fraudulent conduct in the State Department to be made a case number?

Now, it seems to me that we can find out if he is, and then that's that. And the second question is, Does the Senator know the name of this man? He can say "Yes" or "No" and that would be that and we could get on with this thing.

Senator LODGE. I hope Senator McCarthy will be allowed to proceed in the normal way.



Senator TYDINGS. I still leave my two questions to be answered. I think that the most important thing before this committee is to clear out men in high places if they are guilty of fraudulent conduct, suppressing evidences of disloyalty in the State Department. There is nothing we are going to do that is more important than that.

Senator LODGE. Of course I favor doing that too. We all want to get rid of all the rotten apples in the State Department. That is the purpose of this investigation, and simply because I object to Senator McCarthy being torn apart this way does not mean I am not interested in getting these men cleared out. But this is a most extraordinary and unusual procedure, to start off in this confused way. It is not the way things are done around here.

Senator TYDINGS. All he has to do is answer two very simple questions: "I don't know the name of this man, Senator," or "I do know the name of this man, Senator. He won't be made a case subject."

Senator HICKENLOOPER. How will that help the investigation at this point, if he answers?

Senator LODGE. If he says it at 3 o'clock this afternoon, why isn't that just as good? You have waited all this time before you brought it up.

Senator TYDINGS. This is a public hearing and I do not want too much of this in star chamber.

Senator LODGE. Let's have it in public in Senator McCarthy's own time and own way. Give him the courtesy of letting him make the charges to the best advantage from his viewpoint.

Senator McMAHON. As I understand it, what you want is to know the name of this man as quickly as possible, because it is conceivable, because of what Senator McCarthy said about him, that he could frustrate this investigation. As I understand it, that is the purpose of the question. It is obvious that he hasn't got it with him at the moment. It is too bad that he hasn't, because I, too, would like to know if this rascal is in the State Department, and if that is what he is up to, and I hope that before the end of the day we can have the name of this person, because I think it is pertinent, Senator, at the beginning of this investigation, to drag out this key figure, who is apparently, if your charge is true, right down there with his hand on the throttle, and we ought to know that as quickly as possible.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, this man has been in the State Department, apparently, according to the statement of Senator McCarthy, I think, on the floor, since, let us say, 1947.

Senator TYDINGS. And is still there.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. All right. He has been in the State Department, perhaps—I do not know who he is—since Senator McCarthy made his charges on the floor of the Senate. If he is going to do any dirty work, he has had all the time since 1947, and especially since Senator McCarthy made his formal statement on the floor of the Senate; he has had all that time to do whatever dirty work he might potentially do, and I do not see that another day will add to his potential danger very much over what he may have done in the past, if he is guilty.

Therefore, I think Senator McCarthy ought to be able to proceed in his own way.

Senator TYDINGS. Just a minute. I was very hopeful that we could get answers to these two questions. You could say "I don't know the name of the man" or "I do know the name of the man," because you have said that you had photostatic copies of the files, as I recall your testimony. And if you said you knew the man, we weren't going to ask you to give us that name this morning. But we just wanted to get at that the very first thing and have that man, if he is in the State Department now, relieved of his duties pending this investigation. We don't want to be charged with having let him roam around the State Department where he can keep on with doctoring the records, if he has access to them.

The first thing I asked you—the other proposition was the second—was, Was he to be made one of the case numbers? That is, was he to be a man against whom you were going to bring charges?

Now certainly it is very hard for the chairman to believe that a charge of this kind would not be a case number and if it is to be a case number, all right; say so. We will forget it. If it is not to be a case number, then we had better look into it right away.

Senator McCARTHY. May I have the chairman's copy of the resolution?

Senator LODGE. It seems to me that the time to try to get this particular individual was after Senator McCarthy mentioned him on the floor of the Senate, rather than to wait for two whole weeks and bring it up now this morning.

Senator TYDINGS. How could I get him when I don't know his name?

Senator LODGE. At this Roman holiday we are having here this morning it looks to me as though all of a sudden we have gotten interested in this man, when 14 days have gone by within which Senator McCarthy could have been asked the same question, if there was such a terrible urgency about it. I just don't see why we can't have proceedings go along in a normal way. If Senator McCarthy is allowed to make a statement without interruption he will probably reach this case today sometime.

Senator TYDINGS. I am not so certain. He said it was No. 57. He also said he could take up only a certain number of cases today, and we do not know when we are going to meet again. But the point is this: I have asked two simple questions; one, Is this man to be made a case number? Do you know the name of the man? If there is anything of an inquisitorial nature about getting an answer to those two questions before we proceed, I do not know what it is. The answer is very simple, and it seems to me that we could get the answers and dispose of it and go on with something else.

Senator McCARTHY. May I answer the chairman, and that is, that I will be unable to give him detailed information on case No. 57 this morning. In order to get the complete picture of that case, he will need the files.

Senator TYDINGS. You have the files.

Senator McCARTHY. Just a minute. I say in order to get the detailed information necessary for the committee to act it will be necessary that you subpoena the files. Let's make this clear when we speak of files. If the committee wants to be sure they have the complete files, it will be necessary to subpoena a number of things.

No. 1, you will have to subpoena the loyalty files, both categories, the part that you will normally be handed plus the sub rosa section.

No. 2, you will have to subpoena the personnel files, and by that I don't mean merely the subsection of the personnel files.

No. 3, in order to check that, it will be necessary for you gentlemen to subpoena the Civil Service Commission files. I understand that the State Department has a loose-leaf file. The Civil Service Commission has a copy of those files, a little more intricate filing system. The FBI also has a copy of that section of the files, which was compiled by the FBI.

Let me say this: Every case that I am giving you gentlemen today, every case that you will hear about, will have in the files derogatory information developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Merely the top half of the State Department's loyalty file will be meaningless. I assure you of that.

Now this case No. 57, as I have told you three times, Senator, I cannot give you information on that now. If you had called me and told me you wanted that case developed this morning, it would have been developed. The only contact that I have had with the committee was the day the chairman met me on the floor and said, "Come over to the committee at 10:30 Wednesday morning and present whatever you have to us."

I am here ready to do that, Mr. Chairman. As I say, I am not prepared this morning in case No. 57. I am not prepared because the Chair did not indicate he wanted me prepared. I am not prepared, No. 2, because I do not think that is the all-important case. I do think that is a very important case. All of the names—all of the names—will be found in those files that I have suggested you subpoena, so you can get to that very easily.

Now, if the chairman wants case No. 57, I assume he is meeting tomorrow. If he meets tomorrow, if he wants that case developed, it will be developed before the committee. If the committee wants to meet this afternoon, if he wants to come to my office I will try and get him all the information he desires on that case. But this morning I cannot give the chairman the information on case No. 57; period!

Senator TYDINGS. Now let me ask you this: If we were to take a recess for 10 minutes so the Senator could go to his office and refresh his memory on file 57, if that is the file, could he not then come back here and answer the question, to wit, (1), Is this individual against whom these grave charges are made to be the subject of a particular case for investigation, or is he left out of the matter? (2), Does the Senator know his name?

If the Senator will come back and answer those two simple questions, we can go ahead with the procedures. It would only take him 5 or 10 minutes to do it.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, let me say the Chair asks whether I will make him the subject for investigation. I didn't know that I was running this committee. I don't think I am by a long stretch. I intend to submit to the committee information bearing upon the disloyalty, the bad security risks, in the State Department. Then it is up to the committee to investigate those particular cases. The committee has been allowed, I believe, \$25,000 or \$50,000 to do that. I do not have the investigative staff, I do not have access to the files, to make any complete investigation and make any formal charges. All I intend to do, Mr. Chairman, is to submit to the committee the evi-

dence which I have gathered over painstaking months of work, and I hope that the Chair will allow me to give that tomorrow, and I assure that chairman that there will be no names, nothing kept secret from this committee. He can be sure of that.

I say, if the Chair had informed me that he was particularly interested in case No. 57, that case would have been developed this morning. As it is, it will not be developed this morning because I am not prepared to do so, and after a 10-minute recess I would not be prepared to do so. I have some facts which I hope the committee will allow me to present to them this morning.

Senator TYDINGS. If the Senator will allow me to read just one sentence from case 14, he says, "In his case a CSA"—what is a "CSA"?

Senator McCARTHY. That is the investigative agency, as I understand it.

Senator TYDINGS. I don't know.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, when you ask a question, let me finish, please.

I don't understand this lettering system too well. "CSA" I believe is—they change the names of the organizations over there so much I can't keep track of them. It is the investigative agency, or something along that line.

Senator TYDINGS (reading):

In this case a CSA report of September 22, 1947, is replete with information covering the attempt of a high State Department official to induce several individuals who had signed affidavits reflecting adversely upon the employee to repudiate their affidavits. The file shows that that high State Department employee went out and personally contacted the individuals who signed the affidavits and asked them "Won't you repudiate them?"

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, let me say this. I have quoted from the files in 81 cases. The President of the United States has answered merely by saying that McCarthy is lying; it is not true. This committee can very easily determine where the truth lies by saying "We shall get those files." When you get those files, then you will know whether or not every word I have spoken here is true.

Now, when I get to case No. 57 I will give you all of the information which I can on it. That will not be complete. You will have to get four separate files to make sure you have the complete case.

Senator LODGE. Mr. Chairman, so far as one member of this committee is concerned, speaking for myself, I do not understand what kind of a game is being played here, and I cannot do my work as a member of this committee if we are going to do this picking and choosing and jumping around all over the place. If we are going to depart from the usual procedure of having him make his charges, then he makes his charges and we investigate the charges, I want to know that. But I do not understand at all what is sought to be achieved by this business of picking first one case and then another case and asking the witness about that before he has even had a chance to make a single connected statement.

Senator TYDINGS. Senator Lodge, as I will try to tell you once more—I thought I had made it plain—I have no disposition to interfere with the witness going ahead with any statement he has before him. I put in the record all of the proceedings, and one of the proceedings put in the record was the one to which I have just drawn attention, and in that particular case I found this statement. I simply

asked the witness, to make the record complete, whether or not this was one of the 81 cases which he wanted investigated, to wit, that a high State Department official had tried to cook or alter or doctor the evidence, and if he had said "Yes" or "No," that would have been one thing.

Then I asked him if he knew the name of this man, thinking it would be very desirous for the committee to get that man out of this investigation and all contact with the papers at the earliest possible moment.

It seems to me that if those two questions had been answered, and I can see no reason why they could not be answered, either that they are going to be made a case or they are not going to be made a case, and that "I do know the name and will give it to the committee in due time" or "I don't know the name and cannot give it to the committee"—if there is anything captious or inquisitorial or bad about just asking those two questions, to me they are the simplest kind of thing, and they make the record which we have already made complete as to whether this man is one of the 81 cases or whether he is not, and that "I know his name and in due time I will give it to the committee" or "I don't know the name and I can't give it to the committee."

Senator LODGE. If there was such an awful hurry about getting this man, it seems to me the time to have done it would have been immediately after Senator McCarthy raised the point on the floor of the Senate. It is just a question here of orderly procedure.

Senator TYDINGS. You do not see things on the floor of the Senate you see when you read them over, Senator Lodge.

Senator LODGE. We can all read the Congressional Record, and, if the thing is there, it is perfectly possible to go to work on it then, instead of waiting for two whole weeks until we have this hearing. It seems to me this is a perfectly extraordinary procedure. I have never seen anything like it, and I have been here since 1937. You have been here longer than I have. But I have been here since 1937, and it is a perfectly amazing procedure to pick No. 57 and then to pick No. 14, and I suppose after you are through playing with that you will pick 23. In the meantime the witness sits here. He has a prepared statement and he isn't given the common, ordinary courtesy of telling his story in his own words. I think it is perfectly amazing. I don't know what the purpose of it is, because I haven't been told.

Senator TYDINGS. There is nobody knows what the purpose is except myself, because on my word of honor I have never discussed it with any of my Democratic colleagues or Republican Colleagues. It simply occurred to me that this was about the most serious thing I had run across and I wanted simply to know whether a special case was to be made out against this individual and whether the Senator had his name, and if he had answered those questions "Yes" or "No" he would have been probably a third through with his written statement. If there is any reason why they should not be answered I do not know why the Senator does not say it, or say "Yes, they will be a special case. They ought to be a special case, and in due time I will give the committee his name." I can see no reason why that could not be done. If there is a reason, I have not heard it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in reading over the Congressional Record when these cases and charges were

made by Senator McCarthy that there are quite a number of charges of very serious importance in this whole set-up. I would not necessarily pick this case as the most serious, just from reading the record. I think there are others that probably will come in for just as serious consideration. Therefore I see no justification in picking out this particular case for special interrogation at the moment.

And then, another thing, it seems to me that this committee will make the cases, not necessarily Senator McCarthy. Senator McCarthy gives his evidence and gives his conclusions, and furnishes this committee with what he believes to be facts or the sources of the facts for investigation, and then it is up to this committee to differentiate and to examine and to make the cases.

I strongly urge that a perfectly normal, sound procedure is to let Senator McCarthy, who has originated these charges, go ahead and make his charges and canvass his situation, and then let's question him about the individual cases if we want to.

Senator TYDINGS. The Chair will try to comply with the requests of the two Republican members of the committee and he will simply finish this phase of the matter by asking Senator McCarthy, the next time he comes before the committee, to be in a position to answer two questions: First, is the "high State Department official" who allegedly attempted to doctor the loyalty records in the State Department to be made the subject of a special case in the information and charges that he will bring before us? Secondly, does he know the name of this individual, and will he give it to the committee in executive session?

So, with those two things in the Senator's mind, if he will furnish them at the next meeting, I will be glad to have him go ahead with his statement. I am sorry we could not get them this morning.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have a question that I would like to suggest to Senator McCarthy at this time which I may ask him later—I don't know—along this same line. I may see fit to ask Senator McCarthy if he believes, based upon what knowledge and investigation he has had, that the high State Department official which has been referred to here might well be, upon the evidence developed, the subject for investigation and further inquiry by this committee. I say I may ask the Senator that question at a later date, when he is prepared to canvass the particular case that involves this allegedly high State Department official.

Senator TYDINGS. I will ask the Senator if he will be good enough to try to bring the answers to those two questions of the committee at the next meeting of the committee. I think I have conformed to his wish to postpone and give him time. I would rather have had them this morning. I think they are very important. I think it is the most important thing in the whole investigation, and I am sorry that, it being so important, he hasn't that evidence available.

Now, Senator, we will be glad to hear your statement.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, UNITED STATES  
SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN**

Senator McCARTHY. I thank the chairman, and so there is no doubt in the committee's mind let me say this: I think this is so important that I do want to stick to the cases as I document them and develop

them so there can be no question about the absolute truth of everything presented.

Let me say this also: I hope that every witness' testimony, including mine, is gone through with a fine-tooth comb. There are some very important witnesses down here, and I am very happy the chairman swore them all. We have found, you recall, back in the case of the famous racketeers of Capone that the Government could not get them for their crimes, but they finally discovered a way of getting them. They got them for income tax evasion.

We find where Communists are concerned they are too clever. They work underground too much. It is hard to get them for their criminal activities in connection with espionage, but a way has been found. We are getting them for perjury and putting some of the worst of them away. For that reason I hope every witness who comes here is put under oath and his testimony is gone over with a fine-tooth comb, and if we cannot convict some of them for their disloyal activities, perhaps we can convict them for perjury.

Senator TYDINGS. Are you going to relate to cases in the same order before the Senate, so I can follow them here?

Senator McCARTHY. I intend to give the committee additional cases.

Senator TYDINGS. If you refer to case 1 or case 2, that will be case 1 or case 2 as you referred to it in the Senate?

Senator McCARTHY. When I refer to a case, I will also identify it by the case number if it was referred to in the Senate.

Now, the chairman made a statement that I think he would like to retract, because he said: "McCarthy will be subject to the most thorough investigation in the history of this Republic." I think he meant that the disloyal people in the State Department will be subject to such investigation.

Senator TYDINGS. I did not say "McCarthy." I said this. I said: "This, Senator McCarthy, will be one of the most thorough investigations \* \* \*." I did not make it personal.

Senator McCARTHY. Some people in the room got the impression he said that.

Senator TYDINGS. If they got that impression they got something I did not intend.

Senator McCARTHY. I did not think he did.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the committee for its invitation to appear here today, and make available information which has come to me from a variety of sources bearing on the security of our Nation.

Certainly we are all in accord on the premise that every possible precaution should be taken to protect the national welfare and time and experience has shown us that subversive and un-American actions cannot stand the light of day.

To that end, I shall make available to this committee the names and background of persons who are, or have been, in the service of the Government who, by virtue of their background and activities, do not deserve the confidence and trust placed in them.

The fair security risk does not exist. Every man or woman in the employ of the United States Government is a bad or good security risk.

We have had, through our courts, our governmental investigating bodies, our public press and radio, a shocking and frightening series of reports on men and women in high and low places in our Government who transferred their allegiance to a foreign and dangerous ideology.

It is obviously impossible for me, without investigative personnel, funds, and authority and without full and free access to the voluminous and comprehensive files of numerous Government agencies, to give you gentlemen an adequate picture of this distressing situation.

I hope that this distinguished committee, charged by its colleagues in the Senate with a difficult and exhaustive duty, will be able to find a solution to a hitherto insoluble problem.

After the information I have received is collated and examined, it will be turned over to this committee. I shall withhold nothing and shall make available to the committee the information which has been made available to me.

I have carefully studied the standards of loyalty, as set forth by Secretary of State Acheson.

I agree with them wholeheartedly.

I have come to the conclusion, however, that these standards of loyalty are meaningless unless they are applied to all Government employees without exception.

It is the exception that I wish to bring to the attention of the committee.

I am convinced that in a sizable number of cases these standards have not been applied properly.

Mr. Chairman, one bad risk is too many, and a very few of these bad risks might well be disastrous to our national security.

At the outset I think it is important that the committee know that the statement I shall make here today regarding various persons in the employ of the United States Government is based on documented evidence and these documents I will submit to the committee as I go along.

Senator McMAHON. Senator, is it your intention to name individuals against whom you are making charges?

Senator McCARTHY. I intend to name names of those that are thoroughly documented and important, yes. The ones that are not thoroughly documented I intend to give to the committee and have the committee, with its own investigative staff, do the documenting.

Senator McMAHON. Senator, as I understand it, this is the first of a series of cases in which you are going to name names.

Senator McCARTHY. That is right.

Senator McMAHON. And you are going to give to the public and to us the digests of the files as you have had them given to you?

Senator McCARTHY. In this first case I am going to give nothing from any files. I am going to present documents.

Senator McMAHON. What documents?

Senator McCARTHY. I am going to give them to you as I go along.

Senator McMAHON. I mean, are they abstracts of the State Department files?

Senator McCARTHY. I will give you the documents, Senator, as I go along. They are photostats, and I can't give you a preview. I have to go through them.



Senator LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I don't like to be tedious about this, but I do hope—

Senator McMAHON. Senator, if you do not mind, I have not yielded.

There is a very important point involved here, Senator, whether you realize it or not, and this is the point where this committee is going to have to consider it, as to whether or not we are going to adopt a procedure whereby charges are made about citizens for all the world to see, based upon material that has been taken from files without an opportunity for the committee to have a full preview of that file.

Now, what I have in mind is the Coplon case and what took place down in the district court. I have no fixed opinion on this at the moment, Senator, but I just want the committee to understand that apparently we are going to open up the files for public inspection. Is that the Senator's idea?

Senator McCARTHY. No, no. I have no intention—even if I had the files I would have no intention—of presenting any of the State Department files. I say “even if I had them.” It is not my decision to conduct the hearing in this fashion. The committee has asked for information. I have the documents. The names appear on the documents very clearly. If the committee wants to go into executive session and take this testimony, that is entirely up to the committee. Otherwise I shall have to proceed, and it is impossible to develop this and say “Mr. X,” “Mr. Y,” “Mr. Z.” Do you follow me, Senator?

If the committee wants to go into executive session and hear these cases, let me tell you without mentioning her name that the first case will involve a person in a high State Department position getting about \$12,000 a year who belongs to 28 organizations that have been listed by the Attorney General and by various senatorial and House committees as subversive or disloyal—28 different organizations. I have the documents to show that she has belonged to those 28 subversive organizations—not organizations that I say are subversive, but organizations that the Attorney General has said are subversive, plus senatorial and House committees.

In presenting these documents, I think it is impossible to dismiss or hide this individual's name. I think this is very important. We will want to ask, for example, Mr. Acheson why he keeps in a high position, a \$12,000-a-year position, someone who belongs to 28 subversive organizations. She may, you understand, belong to 10 or 12 others. I have the documents to show the membership in 28.

I have no desire whatsoever to make this name public, but the committee has called me here. They say, “Give us information,” and I can't give this information by referring to X, Y, and Z.

Senator TYDINGS. I think, Senator McMahon, your question is a proper one, but I believe the better way to handle it would be when we get to a document to ask for a description of it, et cetera, rather than to try to make a blanket ruling here where we might have to amend it over and over again. Do you agree with that, Senator? In other words, postponing the time until the Senator gets to the document, and then we can ascertain whether or not it is a State Department matter or loyalty file or FBI file, or what the matter may be.

I don't think we want to get in the position of denying the witness any proper testimony that he might deliver.

Senator McMAHON. It is a very difficult question, and I would defer to you as chairman of this committee on this matter of procedure. The only thing that disturbs me is this: Let us assume that the Senator charges this specific person what is true and is determined to be true. Then there is certainly no reason why the public should not be advised of the fact that she is what he says she is.

Contrariwise, let us assume, hypothetically, that it turns out on an investigation that she is completely innocent of the charges that are made. Senator, you and I know that that verdict will be on page 27 or 47, if there are 47 pages, but the charges will be on page 1.

Senator McCARTHY. I must say I heartily agree with you.

Senator McMAHON. And we must be careful, it seems to me, that in our desire to do a thorough job of investigation here and bring to book—and they should be brought to book—any persons who do not belong in the Government of the United States, not, in the process of doing that, to do a great injustice to decent American citizens.

Senator McCARTHY. May I say that I heartily agree with the Senator. On the Senate floor I said that I would not divulge any names. I said I hoped any names that were divulged would be developed in executive session. Mr. Lucas, who is the leader of the majority party, demanded time after time on the Senate floor and publicly that I divulge names. I am now before the committee. In order to present the case I must give the names, otherwise I cannot intelligibly present it. If the committee desires to go into executive session, that is a decision that the committee and not I can make, but if I am to testify, I say it is impossible to do it without divulging names.

Senator LODGE. Mr. Chairman, may I get recognized now? This committee unanimously voted to hold public hearings. That was our decision. Senator McCarthy now has the opportunity to name names. That is his decision. If he wants to give this information in private, then we have to decide whether we will hear them or not. Those issues were all settled when we had our meeting last week. I do not understand why Senator McCarthy cannot have the opportunity to present his statement and not be compelled to act as though he were in some sort of a kangaroo court—"Answer 'Yes' or 'No'" and that sort of thing. It almost looks as though there was an attempt to rattle him. We ought to let him make his statement, and then, if he has facts with him, we will investigate the facts. It seems to me just as simple as that.

Senator TYNINGS. Gentlemen of the committee, so far as the Chair is concerned about this, I think we ought to leave pretty well the manner of presenting the evidence up to Senator McCarthy. Senator, at any time that you feel you want to go into executive session with part of this testimony, if you will indicate that I will call the committee right here together and we will see what the situation is. If any member of the committee at any time thinks that the matter that is being made public should be heard in executive session, he will indicate that to me. We will go into a huddle and come out with a decision on that. In the meantime, proceed.

Senator McCARTHY. Let me make my position clear. I personally do not favor presenting names, no matter how conclusive the evidence is. The committee has called me this morning, and in order to intelligibly present this information I must give the names. I think this

should be in executive session. I think it would be better. However, I am here. The committee has voted to hold open sessions, so I shall proceed.

Let us take the case of Dor—

Senator TYDINGS. I told you when I invited you to testify that you could testify in any manner you saw fit. If it is your preference to give these names in executive session we will be very glad to have your wishes acceded to. If it is your desire to give them in open session, that is your responsibility. Now, if you will indicate how you want to proceed, the committee will take it under advisement and give you an answer in 2 minutes.

Senator McCARTHY. Let me say this first case has been handed to the press already. I think we will have to proceed with this one in open session. When we get to the next case, let us consider it.

Let us take the case of Dorothy Kenyon.

Senator TYDINGS. Is that one of the cases your brought up on the Senate floor?

Senator McCARTHY. This is not.

Senator TYDINGS. I see. Go ahead.

Senator McCARTHY. This lady, according to the latest issue of the official registry of the United States Government, is on the Commission on the Status of Women, United States Member on the Commissions of the Economic and Social Council, United States Mission to the United Nations, Department of State. Her salary is \$12,000 per year.

And I now present to the chairman of the committee the documentation of that part of my testimony.

Senator TYDINGS. Will you hold that a minute until I find whether it is listed here in the Register or not.

Senator McCARTHY. This lady has been affiliated with at least 28 Communist-front organizations, all of which have been declared subversive by an official Government agency. Nine of the 28 have been cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, and I might say that her record of belonging to these subversive organizations dates back 10 or 15 years. It is not something new.

On February 21, 1940, Miss Kenyon signed a protest under the auspices of the Veterans of Abraham Lincoln Brigade condemning the war hysteria "being whipped up by the Roosevelt administration."

Exhibit marked "1" I now hand the committee. This organization has been cited as subversive by the congressional House Committee on Un-American Activities, the California Un-American Activities Committee, and the Attorney General of the United States.

Senator TYDINGS. Will you let us read that a minute. Is her name marked?

Senator McCARTHY. I think you will find her name marked.

Senator TYDINGS. I have it. It isn't marked. We will mark it. Let me read, Senator, for the record, the caption:

The following outstanding Americans, writers, poets, playwrights, educators, judges, critics, and public officials signed the letter to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson protesting the attacks upon the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and condemning the war hysteria now being whipped up by the Roosevelt administration.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I might say that this is the only photostat that I have, and I do not like to have it out of my possession.

If the committee wants these documents, I wish they would arrange with me to have them photostated so they may have a photostatic copy of the document.

Senator TYDINGS: Senator McCarthy, we will have to file all of the exhibits in the record that you give publicly, and I will instruct the stenographer to guard these exhibits, and when the committee finishes its deliberations to return them to you. Is that all right?

Senator McCARTHY: May I ask one other thing, Mr. Chairman. This is my only copy. I wonder if the Chairman would not instruct the clerk to have photostats made so that my file may be complete.

Senator McMAHON: Could I ask a question on that?

Senator TYDINGS: Yes.

Senator McMAHON: Senator, this is a clip from the Daily Worker, February 21, 1940, and it is entitled "Signers of Protest."

Senator McCARTHY: That's right.

Senator McMAHON: Of course, the list is a very lengthy one. As to some of the people on this list, I see one or two that I know casually myself. The description of the petition that was signed is the Daily Worker's description, and it does not appear to be a copy of the petition that these people signed. Is the Senator aware of that?

Senator McCARTHY: I think the Senator has stated it correctly.

Senator McMAHON: Yes.

Well, knowing the Daily Worker and its genius, from the copies that I have seen, for misrepresentation, I am curious as to just what the petition said. You haven't got that with you, have you?

Senator McCARTHY: I am sure when the Senator sees the 28 documents he will no longer be skeptical.

Senator McMAHON: It is not a question of that. I am curious as to what they did sign. It may be that in this instance the Daily Worker is telling the truth as to what they signed, do you see? But the Senator has not got the actual petition that they signed?

Senator McCARTHY: That is correct. That is a copy of the petition run in the Daily Worker as a paid ad, and advertised as having been run by these people.

Senator TYDINGS: Does the Senator know where we could get the original, so we could see what the petition purported to advocate?

Senator McCARTHY: I think the committee must hire a competent staff to run anything down they care to run down.

Senator TYDINGS: I say, does the Senator have any idea of where we might search for this particular item, so we can save time in finding it?

Senator McCARTHY: There are many places the Senator could search. I do not know where he could find it.

Senator TYDINGS: The question that the Senator does not answer, apparently, is that the Senator has no information. I am simply trying to find out where we could get it in the quickest possible time.

Senator McCARTHY: I do not have the original petition. I do not know where it is.

Senator McMAHON: I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should, as quickly as possible, get this petition, for this reason, that there are in this list about 100 names, and some of them bear good reputations. Now, to characterize them in a record of the Senate of the United States just on the basis of a clip from the Daily Worker is something that perhaps they are not entitled to either, so I do hope that we can get what they really signed.

Senator McCARTHY. I hope I have made it clear that I also hope that the committee proceeds to develop the situation.

Senator TYDINGS. Before the Senator proceeds, without any reflection on the press, newspaper accounts are not always the best evidence. The petition itself, as the Senator, who has been an eminent judge, would know, would be the best evidence, but we have a pretty wide latitude in these committees and we can look that phase of the matter over afterward.

Senator McCARTHY. Thank you.

In signing this statement Miss Kenyon collaborated with such well-known Communists as Paul Robeson, Bernard J. Stern, Albert Maltz, Anna Louise Strong, William Gropper, Langston Hughes, and Harry F. Ward.

Miss Kenyon is presently the sponsor of the National Council of American Soviet Friendship. This organization has been declared subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee, the California Un-American Activities Committee, and the Attorney General.

Understand, when I say "presently," some of this information may be 6 months old. It is the best information, and I have no information that it has been withdrawn.

On November 16, 1948, Miss Kenyon as a member of the board of sponsors of this officially declared subversive organization welcomed the Red Dean of Canterbury, Hewlett Johnson, at a rally in Madison Square Garden in the city of New York. Only a few days ago the State Department refused to permit the Dean of Canterbury to enter the United States because of his Communist record.

For the guidance of the committee I hand you herewith exhibit 2, which fully documents Miss Kenyon's affiliation with the National Council of American Soviet Friendship.

Senator McMAHON. Senator, that National Council of American Soviet Friendship had quite a vogue when we were cobelligerents back during the war days. I may be in error, but I think that there were a couple of Senators of the United States who are still members of this body who were members of that organization at the time. Are you aware of that?

Senator McCARTHY. The Senator is talking about war days. This document is dated late 1948, November 16, 1948. And, Senator, I may say this, that I have not declared these organizations subversive. I tell you in each instance which official bodies have. In this case it was declared subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee, the California Un-American Activities Committee, and the Attorney General.

I assume when they declared this organization subversive they did it upon very excellent and competent proof, so when I refer to these subversive organizations I am not saying that I myself have determined whether or not they are subversive.

Senator McMAHON. I did not assert that you did. I just asked you whether or not it is not a fact that a couple of the Senators had been members of the National Council of American Soviet Friendship. I would doubt, of course, that it was as late, though, as November 16, 1948, and you do point out that she was a member of the Board on that date.

Senator TYDINGS. Senator McCarthy, going back to the first exhibit that you introduced, I see some names on here that I think it only fair ought to be associated with the evidence you have given. I see such names as Ernest Hemingway, Dr. Harold Urey, the man who was in the forefront of development of the atomic bomb for the United States, and several others I recognize by reputation, some of them holding public office. I believe here is one man, the Honorable Stanley Isaacs; my recollection is that he holds an office in New York State of some kind. So that there is rather a large mixture of names that are pretty prominent.

Senator McCARTHY. This is exhibit 2, Mr. Chairman. It is a letter on the letterhead of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, and has a list of the sponsors, Kenyon's name being one of the list of sponsors. The letter reads as follows—or would the chairman rather see it before I read it?

Senator TYDINGS. This is 2?

Senator McCARTHY (reading):

On Monday evening, December 13, the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, and foremost leader in the democratic movement for world peace, speaks at Madison Square Garden. This eminent churchman, who will climax a month's tour of the United States with this rally, will present his impressions of the American peace movement as it relates to the peace forces of England and the continent. He will also report on his recent observations of conditions in eastern Europe and his personal conversations with the leaders of the new democracies.

We feel it is a rare privilege, indeed, for us to be able to present the dean in the first significant rally to follow the elections. We know you will appreciate the importance of forcefully demonstrating, particularly before the new congressional session, the people's will for peace through cooperation and friendship with the Soviet Union.

The Ambassador from the Soviet Union, His Excellency Mr. Alexander S. Panyushkin, will address the meeting. The meeting will also feature Paul Robeson, other well-known speakers, and a program of entertainment.

As you may recollect, thousands were turned away from the Garden on the occasion of the dean's last visit here in 1945. Thus, to insure you proper accommodations, we are enclosing an advance ticket order blank.

Senator TYDINGS. What was the date of that?

Senator McCARTHY. This is November 16, 1948.

Won't you plan to attend this rally for peace and reserve seats for yourself and your friends?

I point out that Miss Kenyon was not merely a member of this organization but one of the sponsors, and I hand the Chair the exhibit labeled "2."

Senator TYDINGS. Will you pause a moment there, Senator, until we look at the document?

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, while the balance of the committee are looking at the document, may I inquire as to how long the committee intends to remain in session today?

Senator TYDINGS. How long would you like us to remain?

Senator McCARTHY. I frankly had hoped to develop three or four cases. However, I do want to be on the floor today, and my thought is that we should certainly develop more than we have now, but I would not like to stay away more than an hour.

Senator TYDINGS. I have conferred with the members of the committee, and most of them seem to be of the opinion that we could continue for another half hour. Their engagements are such that at that time they won't be able to remain.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I might suggest that Senator McCarthy probably can get through with his presentation and the presentation of his exhibits which he alleges support his position if we just let him go.

Senator TYDINGS. Yes; but Senator, we want to get all the evidence that is pertinent as we go along. We do not want to get it lopsided. We want to make sure that everything is weighed properly and proper connotations are put on it.

Senator McCARTHY. May I ask the Chair, so I may make preparations, is it planned that we will have daily hearings?

Senator TYDINGS. We will meet tomorrow morning at 10:30, and the only possible change I can see to that would be that the Senate would agree to some unanimous-consent agreement during the day to vote prior to 12 o'clock. We will certainly run from 10:30 to 12, and maybe longer, if we are not confronted with a vote in the Senate.

Tomorrow I hope you will have the answers to those two questions, Senator McCarthy.

Senator McCARTHY. I am sure the Chair will be satisfied with the information he gets.

Senator GREEN. With regard to this exhibit that has been put in as evidence, I would like to draw attention to some of the names on these sponsors of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., which is considered such a Communist group. Here are the Honorable Arthur Capper—

Senator TYDINGS. Senator Capper?

Senator GREEN. Yes. The Honorable Claude Pepper; the Honorable Elbert D. Thomas; the Honorable Joseph E. Davies, and a great many other similar names.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. There are a great many others that the Senator could read too, off that list.

Senator GREEN. If there are, I would like for you to read them.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I do not want to take the time. That is an exhibit the Senator has put in to substantiate the fact that the person he alleges was a sponsor of an organization, and it seems to me we are wasting time.

Senator GREEN. And the names on it are significant.

Senator TYDINGS. No exhibit can be given in part under any rules of evidence that I have ever heard of, either before a Senate committee or anything else. You have to put it all in or keep it all out.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That is what he has offered.

Senator TYDINGS. The Senator has read a letter and he has read one name. I am going to take the liberty of reading all the names:

Louis Adamic, a candidate for the Senate in Illinois; George F. Addes; Maxwell Anderson, playwright; John Taylor Arms; Max Bedecht; Mrs. Alice S. Beleston; Dr. Henry Lambert Bibby; Mrs. Louis Bloch; Mrs. Anita Block; Simon Breines; Prof. E. W. Burgess; Hon. Arthur Capper. Was he a United States Senator at the time this was held? Charles Chaplin; Hon. John M. Coffee; Dr. Henry S. Coffin; Aaron Copland; Norman Corwin; Jo Davidson; Hon. Joseph E. Davies; Dr. Herbert John Davis; Hon. Hugh DeLacy, Member of Congress; Dr. Stephen Duggan; Prof. Albert Einstein; Max Epstein; Dr. Mildred Fairchild; Dr. Robert D. Feild; Lion Feuchtwanger; the Reverend Joseph F. Fletcher; Homer Folks; Dr. W.

Horsley Gantt; Dr. Caleb F. Gates, Jr.; Dean Christian Gauss; Ben Gold; Dr. Mortimer Graves; Dr. Harry Grundfest.

Also Dr. Alice Hamilton; Lillian Hellman; Mrs. Thomas N. Hepburn; Dr. Leslie Pinckney Hill; Prof. William Ernest Hocking; Dr. Walter M. Horton; Langston Hughes; Dr. Walter Hüllihen; Hon. Stanley M. Isaacs; Dr. Millard H. Jencks; Prof. Howard Mumford Jones; Helen Keller; Rockwell Kent; Dorothy Kenyon; Dr. Serge Koussevitzky, leader of one of the great orchestras, I believe; Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont; William W. Lancaster; Dr. Emil Lengyel; John F. Lewis, Jr.; Prof. Robert S. Lynd; Clifford T. McAvoy; Judge Lois Mary McBride; Maurice Maeterlinck; Fritz Mahler; Dr. Thomas Mann; Frank X. Martel; Dr. Kirtley F. Mather; Lewis Merrill; Dr. George R. Minot; Mrs. Lucy Sprague Mitchell; Dr. Wesley C. Mitchell; Charles Michael Mitzell; Pierre Monteux; Mme. Pierre Monteux; Bishop Arthur W. Moulton; Hon. James E. Murray, United States Senator; Dr. Philip C. Nash; Dr. Robert Hastings Nichols; Eugene O'Neill; Dr. Marion Edwards Park; Dr. Frederick Douglas Patterson; Bishop Malcom E. Peabody; Hon. Claude Pepper, United States Senator; Prof. Ralph Barton Perry; Dr. E. C. Peters; Dr. John P. Peters; Henry W. Pope; Michael Quill; Carl Randau.

Also Anton Refregier; Elmer Rice; Wallingford Riegger; Paul Robeson; Col. Raymond Robins; Earl Robinson; Reid Robinson; Harold J. Rome; Joseph A. Rosen; Joseph A. Salerno; Miles M. Sherover; Raymond P. Sloan; Dr. P. A. Sorokin; Maxwell S. Stewart; Leopold Stokowski, leader of an orchestra; Raymond Swing, radio commentator; Genevieve Tabouis; Hon. Elbert D. Thomas; R. J. Thomas; Dr. Max Thorek; S. A. Trone; Philip H. Van Gelder; R. E. Van Horn; Professor George Vernadsky; Bishop W. J. Walls; Dr. Harry F. Ward; Leroy Waterman; Max Weber; Dr. Henry N. Wieman; Dr. C. C. Williams; Hon. James H. Wolfe; Dr. Max Yergan; Dean Mary Yost; Dr. J. J. Zmrhal; Leane Zugsmith.

I think that they all ought to be in there, so that we can judge from the association the full purport of the letter and the inference.

Senator LODGE. Before you go on, Mr. Chairman, I want to say once again that I am for having questions and I am for having the statements with the proper connotations and proper evaluation, but I think to interrupt the witness every single time and break up his continuity and destroy the flow of his argument, the way we are doing, is not the right procedure.

Senator TYDINGS. Just let me say something here in answer to that, Senator Lodge. I have never in my life been connected with any senatorial, legal, or other inquiry where an exhibit could be placed in evidence and only parts of it read. It is not only fair, it is incumbent upon this committee that the whole exhibit be placed before the press of the country if this is an open hearing, and not just the parts of it that may serve some ulterior motive.

Senator LODGE. Of course if we read the list on every single letter-head of every single thing that is put in here, we will be here until Christmas. I am not objecting to putting in the complete documents in the record; of course I am not objecting to that. I am objecting to this constant interruption of the witness so that he never gets a fair shake, that's all.



Senator GREEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it is the only proper thing for us to do to interrupt. Here the witness has introduced a document, and he ended up his introduction by introducing the document as evidence of the Communist affiliations of Miss Kenyon. He ends up by saying, "other well-known Communists sponsoring the event were Howard Fast, Saul Mills, Ella Winter, John Howard Lawson, and Langston Hughes," and I wanted to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether he thinks it is fair to pick out those names and omit the other names that were read.

Senator LODGE. I think the time to do that is after Senator McCarthy has made his statement. Then we can each one go at him. That is the way it has been done here ever since I have been here. I think the immemorial practice is to let the witness make a statement and then the chairman asks the senior man to ask questions, and then the senior man on the other side, and then he finally comes down to the low man on the totem pole and everybody has his chance to ask questions. That is the way it has always been done. For some reason that has not been made clear to me, whether it is to rattle or whether it is to confuse or something, I do not know, we have an entirely different procedure today.

Senator GREEN. What the witness is attempting to do is to give the impression of a certain instrument—I do not mean to say it is intentional, but the result of the names that he has selected gives a very false impression of the instrument.

Senator LODGE. And the Senator from Rhode Island is perfectly capable of clearing that point up. He is a very eloquent man. He is not a Philadelphia lawyer, he is a Providence lawyer, and when his time comes to question he can clear all those points up, and that is the orderly way to do it from the standpoint of the committee, from the standpoint of the presentation in the press, and from the standpoint of fairness to the witness.

Senator TYDINGS. Senator Lodge, if I may say this, if this were a hearing in executive session, that would be one thing, but these charges are going out all over the country in the press and they ought to go out with all of the evidence available, and not just selected parts of it. If it does not go out in that status before the people of the country, then the people cannot draw the full conclusion that the evidence presented warrants, and I think it has to go that way or it should not go at all, if we are going to have open hearings.

Senator GREEN. We are not attempting to introduce other evidence to contradict the witness or to supplement it. All we want is the full statement, and not extracts.

Senator LODGE. All the evidence is not available. I quite agree with the chairman and with Senator Green that it would be most unfortunate if reputations of innocent persons were in any way besmirched, but we cannot in any possible way clear up the wrong that has been done on the spur of the moment. The time to do that is after the Senator has made his charges. Then we investigate the charges. That is the way to proceed.

Senator GREEN. Mr. Chairman, as was brought out in the introductory discussion of this matter, this is a public meeting and charges go out and are spread all over the country in the newspapers, and if at the time a mistaken summary of a document is given, the correct summary won't catch up with it at all. The matter will be ancient

history and newspapers won't print it. The eloquent Senator from Massachusetts knows as a newspaperman that that is the fact, so it is important to have that false impression removed at the time the list of these people is given out to the press.

Senator LODGE. I also know that there are none of us here in this committee who have the information at hand to correct any misstatements that the witness may make.

Senator GREEN. The witness has given it to us to be given to the public.

Senator TYDINGS. Now that the Chair is overruled, all documents that are submitted will be read in full hereafter so that the people of the country may get all the evidence at the time.

Senator LODGE. That is perfectly all right with me. I have no objection to the documents that the witness puts in being read in full. What I object to is this constant interruption and hacking away at him all the time so he does not get a chance to make his argument.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Just to clear up a statement of the chairman, the Senator from Wisconsin just submitted the Official Register of the United States, 1949, containing on page 490 the name of Dorothy Kenyon, Commission on the Status of Women, New York; salary and compensation, \$12,000 a year. Does the chairman intend to read the entire Official Register of the United States every time the Senator from Wisconsin wants to produce a name or something to prove a specific point?

Senator TYDINGS. I will read into the record the names of all the people on this Commission. I do not see any need to go and put all the consuls from Shanghai to Singapore on the one hand, and Iceland to some other place, in the record.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. But, Mr. Chairman, the witness only introduced that to indicate a position of employment of a particular individual.

Senator TYDINGS. That's right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The other names are not involved one way or another, other than the allegation that she was employed by the State Department.

Senator TYDINGS. And there is no allegation here that this is a Communist-front organization, but there was an allegation in the other case that that was a Communist-front organization, and therefore we ought to see who is in it, which is an entirely different matter.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I just want to know whether the chairman is going to read the entire Register.

Senator TYDINGS. I would also draw the observation that the gentlemen on the right of me are now consuming more time than are the gentlemen on the left.

Senator LODGE. I deny that. I would like to have my comments drawn up against those of the chairman, and we will find out.

Senator TYDINGS. You should not complain and then adopt the very thing you are complaining about.

Senator LODGE. I am not doing that. No, I am not doing that.

Senator MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I think as I give the documents showing the Communist-front organizations that this individual has belonged to, you will find in almost rather a sizable number the names of some fine individuals. I think that it is possible that you yourself may be duped into joining, or having your name used on some Com-

minist-front organization. The reason I submit the vast number is that it is impossible for any normal individual, of normal intelligence, to be so deceived that they can act as sponsors for 28 different Communist-front organizations. I might say that I personally would not be caught dead belonging to any one of the 28.

Senator TYDINGS. That is opinion, Senator. We would like to have the evidence and the facts, and we can judge more from them than we can from opinions. We will have to form the opinions.

Senator LODGE. Surely the Senator can express opinions.

Senator TYDINGS. If we are going to condemn people on opinion evidence, there won't be many people left in the end.

Senator LODGE. If we are going to prevent the Senator from expressing opinions, the character of this whole body is going to change.

Senator McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

I might say that one of the grounds for dismissal of an employee who has top-secret clearance is his associations. As the Senator knows, if he is a banker and he is looking for a cashier and he finds that Mr. Smith chums with safecrackers, bookies, gamblers, cheats, and rogues, he won't hire Mr. Smith as a cashier, and that is the theory that I assume our State Department goes upon. If they find these individuals with unusual connections, a long trend, they can assume that they are unsafe risks. The Secretary has so stated, I believe.

In sponsoring the Red Dean of Canterbury's appearance in the United States a year and a half ago Miss Kenyon collaborated with such pro-Communists as Ben Gold, the avowed Communist leader of the Fur Workers Union, and Paul Robeson.

Here we have the singular situation of the Department of State refusing to admit one of the world's most prominent radical Communist churchmen and on the other hand one of the Department's prominent officials welcoming and sponsoring him to this country.

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, as though perhaps the State Department's left hand does not know what the other hand is doing; or perhaps put it the other way around. The right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

I should now like to hand the committee exhibit 3. This is a cordial invitation to attend a dinner and presentation of the first annual award of the American Russian Institute to President Franklin Roosevelt for "Furthering American-Soviet Relations."

The event occurred on May 7, 1946, at 6:30 o'clock in the evening in the grand ball room of the Pennsylvania Hotel in New York City. The dinner cost \$7.50 a plate.

The American Russian Institute has been cited as subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee, California Un-American Activities Committee, and the Attorney General.

Senator McMAHON. On what date, Senator?

Senator McCARTHY. What date were they cited?

Senator McMAHON. Yes.

Senator McCARTHY. I do not have the dates of the citation. I think the Senator will recall as well as I do the date the Attorney General put out his list.

Senator TYDINGS. Was this before or after the Attorney General put out his list?

Senator McMAHON. That is quite material. You see Senator Lodge, this is a perfect illustration of the value of a question at the proper time to clear up a statement of fact. Here is a dinner which is held under date of May 7, 1946, in New York City. The Senator proceeds to say that the organization that sponsored it was cited as subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee, the California Un-American Activities Committee, and the Attorney General. Now, it is quite conceivable that a person would have been a sponsor on May 7, 1946, and have refused to have been a sponsor a year or a year and a half later, after the American Russian Institute had been denominated as being subversive. There is a perfect illustration of the value of questioning any witness, whether he be a Senator or anybody else, in order to try to convey what the truth of the matter is.

I think it is regrettable, Senator, that you have not that information with you at the present time. I shall secure it and put it in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin sees the wisdom of what the Senator from Connecticut has so pertinently brought out—the great difference that there might be in a case like this, of an innocent person joining what he thought was a worth-while organization or movement or occasion or ceremony on the one hand, thinking there was nothing subversive about it, and who learns later that it is denominated as a subversive organization.

Now, certainly, don't we owe it to these people whose names we are throwing about the country, on the radio and in the press and in magazines and in the newspapers, to at least give them, those who have acted in good faith and with purely patriotic motives, the right to have the testimony surrounded by facts before it is given, so that we do not do infinite harm to people who, I am sure the Senator himself in some cases would say, are not Communists?

Senator LODGE. Before the witness answer that, my able friend from Connecticut addressed me. I do not agree with him at all that this is an example of why it is a good thing to interrupt the witness. It is perfectly possible to make a note of the fact that he did not mention the date and later on bring it out. In fact, I think that is a more effective way to do it. These questions of dates, I noted that myself and I made a note of it to ask the Senator from Wisconsin later, when my turn came to ask questions.

All I want to do is not to break the continuity of the argument. Then let him make the argument, and those who want to try to tear the argument down will have a chance to do it.

Senator TYDINGS. Let me say I thought I was speaking for every member of the committee when I said that I hoped we could conduct this investigation so that it would not be labeled either a witch hunt or a whitewash. In order to do that, if we are going to live up to that formula, it seems to me, if we allow a lot of statements to go in the record that are subject to instantaneous false impressions and conclusions, that we may not have intended to conduct a witch hunt but we are getting pretty close over on the other barrier.

I have no desire to shut off any testimony that the Senator from Wisconsin has, but I would caution him that when he makes a statement he ought to be able to supply the dates so that false impressions and false conclusions cannot be drawn from his testimony, which, even though we corrected it later, might not reach the press and the

radio, and I simply say that that is just justice, nothing more than simple justice.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, I can say right now that the proceedings as far as they have gone this morning, if the proceedings as patterned this morning are to continue throughout this investigation, it is heading for a label of some kind, and I may have to name it.

Senator TYDINGS. I agree with you thoroughly, and I could name it too.

Senator McCARTHY. The Chair just stated that he thought these names should not be all bandied about the country. I have pointed out to the Chair, and I believe this was pointed out by the Attorney General, that in almost any one of these organizations labeled subversive you will find from time to time competent people's names listed. You will not find one individual belonging to 25 or 30.

Senator TYDINGS. That is drawing a conclusion, Senator.

Senator McCARTHY. When the Senator says we shall not put all these names out to the country, it is the Senator who is reading them. I am merely reading the name of this individual who belongs to 28 organizations that have been listed as subversive by the Attorney General, by the House committee, and other official bodies. Let us make it clear that you are referring to all of these names going out. I am not putting those names out; that is the chairman.

Along with the lady sponsoring this dinner appeared Lee Pressman, who has been named as a member of the Communist underground cell in the Government by Whitaker Chambers. Other well-known Communists sponsoring the event were Howard Fast, Saul Mills, Ella Winter, John Howard Lawson, and Langston Hughes.

Senator GREEN. There, I think that is a selected list that you have made up, is it not?

Senator McCARTHY. The present executive director of this subversive organization is Henry H. Collins, late of the State Department, who has been named by Whitaker Chambers as a member of the Communist spy ring operating in the Federal Government.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Didn't you skip a paragraph?

Senator McCARTHY. No.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have another paragraph, following the list of names the Senator read in. I don't know whether the Senator intended to leave the paragraph out or not, or whether I have an accurate copy.

Senator McCARTHY. I beg your pardon. The Senator from Rhode Island interrupted, and I lost my place.

Other well-known Communists sponsoring the event were Howard Fast, Saul Mills, Ella Winter, John Howard Lawson, and Langston Hughes.

Although I shall discuss the unusual affinity of Mr. Phillip C. Jessup, of the State Department, for Communist causes later in this inquiry, I think it pertinent to note that this gentleman now formulating top-flight policy in the Far East affecting half the civilized world was also a sponsor of the American Russian Institute.

The present executive director of this subversive organization is Henry H. Collins, late of the State Department, who has been named by Whitaker Chambers as a member of the Communist spy ring operating in the Federal Government. It was in the home of Mr. Collins,

according to Chambers, that some of the microfilms of secret State Department documents were made. Collins was also one of those who refused to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee as to whether or not he was a Communist Party member.

The Conference on Pan American Democracy has been declared to be a subversive Communist organization by the Attorney General of the United States, the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the California Un-American Activities Committee.

Senator TYDINGS. Senator McCarthy, would you put in the dates there, if you have them?

Senator McCARTHY. I think much of the material the Chair wants will have to be developed by the committee. I just cannot afford to hire the investigators to present a court case to the committee.

Senator TYDINGS. I thought you might have it and it would save us work; that is all.

Senator McCARTHY. I would rather the committee saved me some work.

Senator TYDINGS. You are making charges—

Senator McCARTHY. I am not making charges. I am giving the committee information of individuals who appear to all the rules of common sense as being very bad security risks. I am giving the committee information which I think they are bound to follow under the Senate mandate.

Senator TYDINGS. Let me follow you there.

Senator McCARTHY. Let me finish, Mr. Chairman. Let's have an agreement. When you ask a question, let me finish my answer, will you?

The Senate unanimously gave this committee a mandate. I think that mandate is to develop any information which on its face makes it appear that the individual concerned is a bad security risk. And I frankly do not—let's make this clear—have the staff to take each of the cases and develop it to the point of making a court case. You understand that.

Senator TYDINGS. You have left the committee in a rather embarrassing position, because the resolution which brings us here and which brings you here reads as follows:

In the conduct of this study and investigation, the committee is directed to procure by subpoena and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all Government employees in the Department of State and other such agencies against whom charges have been heard.

Without somebody makes a charge, or you call it a charge, what do we do then? How do we get the records? We are only authorized to get them, by the Senate language, if you or somebody makes a charge. You say you are not making any charge. We are in a pretty small position to issue a subpoena.

Senator McCARTHY. Senator, let me say this. If there is anything you want me to do to make it possible for you to get those subpoenas, I will do it. I am not in a position to file any formal charges. What you mean by a charge I do not know. If you want me to charge that from the evidence it appears that this woman is an extremely bad security risk, that she should not be in the State Department 1 hour, I will be glad to say that. If you tell me what you mean by a charge, what you want me to do so that you will under this

mandate be entitled to say to the President, "We want those files, all of them," you may be sure I will do that.

Senator TYDINGS. Senator, let me say to you that I think all that you have said up to now are charges, and you have given information that you have to support those charges as you see it. I would call them charges. Certainly we are not going to have an investigation without some charges being made, and the Senate itself put the language in. Fortunately I was not there the night the resolution was adopted. I only inherited it, and I have read it over six or eight times. I think that we are perfectly at liberty to get these files by any proper method that we can devise, because of what you are testifying. But I would label them charges, because I am sure you are charging these people with being either Communists or allied with Communists. You called it a Communist spy ring in the State Department, and I think all those things are charges, and I think it is our duty to investigate it. I think they are charges.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, I take it the witness is actually charging that the people to whom he refers in these outlines of information are bad security risks. I take it the Senator is making that charge.

Senator McCARTHY. I am convinced of that. I think any normal man would be convinced of that. If I must do something in addition to that to make it possible for you to get the files, you can be sure I will do it.

Senator TYDINGS. I will consider that what you said are charges.

Senator McCARTHY. I will say before handing you this next document that it is difficult for me to understand the apparent perplexity of my Democratic colleagues on the committee with reference to the names that appear on these documents. I know the Senators are all aware of the fact that if the Communists did not enlist well-meaning and prominent persons in every phase of American life it would not be a front organization. When the FBI turned over the results of its probe of these front organizations to the Attorney General, it was well known that the names of prominent and reputable citizens were intermingled with the Communists and pro-Communists. Despite this knowledge he proceeded to declare without equivocation these organizations that I have specified as Communist front and as subversive and therefore dangerous to our national security; and I might say that the significance of these documents, Mr. Chairman, is not that this woman belongs to one organization that the Attorney General has said is subversive, but her long chain of activity starting from, I believe the first document is 1935, right up to date.

Senator TYDINGS. To reassure you, I do not know of anything you have said so far that we should not investigate.

Senator McCARTHY. Thank you.

Senator McMAHON. I gather, then, from what you have just said, that just because a person's name is on the list of sponsors of an organization which has been declared as—what is the language, "subversive"?

Senator McCARTHY. The Attorney General declares them subversive. Different committees have given them a different label.

Senator McMAHON. That that per se does not make a citizen suspect.

Senator McCARTHY. No. I think this, though, Senator. If you find someone in the State Department who is a member of a Commu-

nist front organization, then you should check the amount of activity he has had in that organization, his association with people who are known Communists. No, definitely not. There are some fine people who have been tricked into having their names placed on these. For example, I would not be surprised, Senator, if some of the members sitting at the table, who are certainly all loyal Americans, might have at some time or another received a letter from an organization, "Will you sponsor a dinner we are throwing for So-and-so?", and you might write back and say "All right."

I do think, however, when you get to people who are on loyalty boards, who are getting top secret clearance, then if you find they even belong to one Communist front organization we should go further. I think when you find that you have a long chain such as we have here, of 28, you have an extremely bad situation.

Senator McMAHON. The point you are making is that it is cumulative. One case might well be just casual and accidental, but your opinion is that it is cumulative, and if there are—how many has she been a member of?

Senator McCARTHY. Twenty-eight I have now. Most likely that is not the entire list.

Senator McMAHON. That is a great number and it is something to be looked into, and it would be very helpful, Senator, and of course I understand that you say you can't do it, but it would be very helpful to me in evaluating it to find how many she joined after the Attorney General went into them, and how many before.

This is said with no reference to this Kenyon woman, whom I never heard of before in my life, but there are some naive people in the country, too, that will join any old thing that comes along.

Senator McCARTHY. Someone so naive is a bad security risk, so naive that they would sponsor 28.

Senator McMAHON. I am not arguing that. I am just pointing out that it would be interesting to find out the dates this woman joined the organizations and when they were declared subversive.

Senator McCARTHY. That is one of the reasons I hope very quickly the committee hires a staff so that these matters can be checked into.

I give the committee exhibit 4, a letterhead of this organization dated November 16, 1938, going back 12 years. The members will note that over 11 years ago Dorothy Kenyon was a sponsor of this organization which held a conference in Washington on December 10 of the same year.

Her Communist associates in this enterprise included Langston Hughes, Rockwell Kent, Lewis Merrill, Mervyn Rathborne, and Dirk J. Struick.

Senator TYDINGS. Put in all the names, Mr. Recorder, in addition to those the Senator has named.

(NOTE.—Other names on the letterhead marked exhibit 4 are as follows:)

Prof. Donald McConnell	Algernon Black
Dr. David Efron	Bruce Bliven
Louis Adamic	Dr. Franz Boas
Dr. Wallace W. Atwood	Heywood Broun
Eleanor Copenhaver Anderson	Erskine Caldwell
Prof. Hugo Fernandez Artucio	Charlotte Carr
Eunice Fuller Barhard	Bennett A. Cerf
Alfred M. Bingham	Evans A. Clark



Gifford A. Cochran	Max Lerner
Dr. Gilberto Concepcion De Gracla	Marine Lopes
Prof. George Counts	Jean Lyons
Malcolm Cowley	George Marshall
Prof. Horace Davis	Lewis Merrill
Prof. Jerome Davis	Dr. Clyde R. Miller
R. E. Diffendorfer	Prof. Gardner Murphy
Bailey W. Diffe	William Pickens
Dr. William K. Dodo	A. Phillip Randolph
Prof. Paul H. Douglas	David Saposs
Dr. Henry Grattan Doyle	Prof. Margaret Schlauch
John L. Elliott	Adelaide Schuilkind
Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild	Guy Emery Shipler
Prof. Irving Fisher	James T. Shotwell
Prof. Eugene Forsey	Upton Sinclair
Margaret Forsythe	George Soule
Frances R. Grant	Isobel Walker Soule
Alberto Grieve	Maxwell Stewart
Sidney Hillman	Isidore F. Stone
Prof. Arthur H. Holcombe	William Wachs
John Haynes Holmes	Prof. Goodwin Watson
Quincy Howe	Roy Wilkins
Rev. William Lloyd Imes	Dr. Max Winkler
Stanley M. Isaacs	Dr. Stephen S. Wise
Gardner Jackson	Max Yergan
Prof. Chester L. Jones	

Senator McCARTHY. The Senator will note this, that you have the names of the same men who have been publicly labeled as Communists on practically each one of these Communist-front organizations as a sponsor or one of the top officers. You will note also that the respectable names that you will find on one or two of these do not permeate the whole file.

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead, Senator. Conclude that page, and then we will try to quit; before you get to the next exhibit.

Senator McCARTHY. It might be of interest to the committee to know that Mervyn Rathborne, a consponsor with Miss Kenyon, has just testified for the Government at the trial of Harry Bridges, stating under oath that he was a member of the Communist Party at the time of this conference and that he was frequently a visitor at the White House.

I think it is important that the committee know that the Communist activities of Miss Kenyon are not only deep-rooted but extend back through the years. Her sponsorship of the doctrines and philosophy of this ruthless and Godless organization is not new.

It is inconceivable that this woman could collaborate with a score of organizations dedicated to the overthrow of our form of government by force and violence, participate in their activities, lend her name to their nefarious purposes and be ignorant of the whole sordid and un-American aspect of their work.

Senator TYDINGS. That finishes exhibit 4. The committee will stand in recess until 10:30 tomorrow morning, in this place.

Senator McCARTHY. May I ask the Chair before you adjourn how long you plan on proceeding tomorrow?

Senator TYDINGS. I would imagine we would go for probably an hour and a half for certain, and maybe 2 hours.

Senator McCARTHY. In other words, to 12:30 or 1 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p. m., the hearing was adjourned, to reconvene at 10:30 a. m. of the following day, Thursday, March 9, 1950.)

He was affiliated with the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, which was denounced as a subversive organization by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This is the organization under whose auspices was held the Cultural and Science Conference for World Peace at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria in New York from March 25 to 29, 1949, and which, incidentally, was denounced by the Secretary—

Senator TYDINGS. Which Secretary?

Senator McCARTHY. Secretary of State Acheson. If I can quote his exact words, I think he said it was "a sounding board for Russian propaganda."

This organization was denounced as an instrument of Soviet propaganda by the State Department.

Dr. Schuman's affiliations with the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions are not casual. He was a member of its policy and program committee in 1948. To those who say many of these Communist-front connections have been at a time when we were friends with Russia, I call attention to the fact that there has been no break from even during the days of the Hitler-Stalin Pact right up until 1948 and 1949. You don't find any change whatsoever in their sponsorship of these Communist front organizations, and I might say that some individuals can come down and say "I didn't know about this organization; I didn't know anything about its aims," but not Dr. Schuman. When he belongs to the organizations I am going to give you, you can be sure he knows what he is doing. This is the man who lectures in the State Department.

He was a signer of a press release of the same organization on March 1, 1949. He was a member of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions for Wallace, according to the Daily Worker, August 18, 1948, page 7, and he again appeared as a sponsor, according to the Daily Worker on October 19, 1948, page 2.

Professor Schuman was a sponsor of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, which was cited as subversive by the Attorney General, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

He was prominent in the affairs of the American Council on Soviet Relations, which has been cited by subversive by the Attorney General, the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the California Committee on Un-American Activities. He was a sponsor of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which has been cited by the same three official bodies as a communistic and subversive organization.

The American Russian Institute, which has also been the recipient of Professor Schuman's aid, has been cited as communistic and subversive by the Attorney General, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

The same adherence applies to the American Slav Congress, which the same three organizations have cited as subversive.

He sponsored the Civil Rights Congress, an organization termed subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities; and he was also affiliated with the Committee for Boycott Against Japanese Aggression, named communistic and subversive by the Attorney

General, the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Professor Schuman lent his name and prestige to the activities of the Friends of the Soviet Union, which was cited by all three of the above as officially a communistic and subversive organization. The African Aid Committee was named subversive and communistic by the Attorney General, the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the California Un-American Activities Committee; and here again we have Professor Schuman as a sponsor. The same three agencies have declared subversive and communistic the National Conference of American Policy in China and the Far East. This is one he has been really active in. They called a conference under the auspices of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. Here again we have Professor Schuman lending aid and comfort to a subversive organization.

We could perhaps continue for hours in elaborating on the pro-Communist affiliations of this consultant to the small group of "untouchables" who determine, force through, and carry out the foreign policy of this country.

I have chosen at random some of the organizations, all pro-Communist in nature, with which this man has been affiliated.

Incidentally, when I talked about this man's activities as a lecturer, I hope I made it clear that that was one of his activities in the State Department. He is also a consultant, one of the authorities on far-eastern affairs, naturally. A most casual survey of these organizations will indicate that, if he is not a card-holding member of the Communist Party, the difference is so slight that it is unimportant.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have before me the photostats of documents showing his connection with these organizations. In view of the fact that the Senate is in session, I am not going to take the Senators' time to read them.

Senator TYDINGS. They will be put in the record at this place as the Senator has marked them.

#### EXHIBIT 36

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF FOREIGN BORN.  
New York 10, N. Y., February 8, 1949.

#### TESTIMONIAL TO ELLIS ISLAND HUNGER STRIKERS

CHARLES DOYLE—GERHART EISLER—IRVING POTASH—FERDINAND C. SMITH—JOHN WILLIAMSON

Hotel McAlpin, New York City, March 3, 1949

DEAR FRIEND: We invite you to join with us in a testimonial dinner to be held at the McAlpin Hotel, New York City, on Thursday evening, March 3, 1949, for the five men who participated in a hunger strike on Ellis Island, during March 1948.

These five men—Charles Doyle, Gerhart Eisler, Irving Potash, Ferdinand Smith, and John Williamson—united in a hunger strike in order that the constitutional right to bail should not be lost to the American people.

As you will remember, people all over the country joined in demonstrations for them and the principle for which they so heroically were ready to give their lives. As a result, bail was granted by the courts.

We are holding this testimonial on the first anniversary of their great fight which is not yet won. Bail has been granted to Irving Potash, Ferdinand Smith, and John Williamson by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. But it is still being denied to Charles Doyle and Gerhart Eisler, although they are at this moment free on the original bail granted by the courts.

Therefore, the fight for bail must go on. This testimonial must demonstrate our determination to continue the defense of Doyle and Eisler and to carry on an effective campaign to defeat the Justice Department's deportation drive.

We hope that you will participate with us in this testimonial. Reservations are \$6 per plate. Reservations for tables of 10 are \$60.

Sincerely yours,

REV. JOHN W. DARR, Jr.  
Chairman, Board of Directors.

EXHIBIT 37

CHINA AID COUNCIL,  
AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY,  
Champaign-Urbana Branch, June 11, 1938.

MISS JANE SWANHAUSER,  
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MISS SWANHAUSER: Since you give us the choice of day for Dr. Su, I will ask for Friday, June 24, or Saturday, June 25. I still leave it to you to decide which of these two days, since I feel it is possible some other branch may have spoken already for one of these two dates I named. Kindly write at once which date I may count upon and send me, first of all, any particulars about Dr. Su that I may use in publicity; also tell me if this trip is to raise money for I must pay \$15 flat if I use a university hall and make any sort of collection. We have little hope of raising much here, as the bowl of rice drive is now on, but we feel that if Dr. Su can speak to the 3,000 students of the summer school who come, many of them from country regions, that they will carry the idea of boycott, etc., back to their homes and spread the idea. I am sure you will consider even this worth while. I shall not be able to do any advertising until I hear from you, so please write as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

ANNA H. RUBIO.

EXHIBIT 38

AFRICAN AID COMMITTEE,  
New York 10, N. Y., January 20, 1950.

DEAR FRIEND: "We have but one appeal to make to you, our brothers abroad—your moral and financial support will highly be appreciated"—that is the message from leaders of the Nigerian workers recently shot down while striking for 80 cents a day pay.

A token contribution of \$200 has already been sent to these workers by our committee. We must send more. With your help, we can do so.

Even if you have already contributed to the African Aid Committee, we urge you to give again in this emergency.

And please help us in reaching others with this appeal by signing and returning the blank below.

Very truly yours,

W. E. B. Du Bois, Chairman.

To Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois,  
African Aid Committee:

I'll be glad to get others to help, too.  
Send me materials for soliciting contributions among my friends and organizations in response to the appeal from the workers of Nigeria.

Name .....

Address .....

(Please sign and return if you can assist in this way.)

## AFRICAN AID COMMITTEE SPONSORS

Elisha Bailey, Panama  
 Louise R. Berman, New York City  
 Dr. Phillips Brooks, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Peter B. Brown, Chicago, Ill.  
 Louis E. Burnham, Birmingham, Ala.  
 Hugh Bryson, San Francisco, Calif.  
 Charles A. Collins, New York City  
 Councilman Eugene P. Connolly, New York City  
 Evelyn Cooper, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Dr. Oliver C. Cox, Tuskegee Institute  
 Bindley C. Cyrus, Chicago, Ill.  
 Wendell P. Dabney, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
 Councilman Benj. J. Davis, Jr., New York City  
 E. A. Davis, Toronto, Canada  
 Earl B. Dickerson, Chicago, Ill.  
 Dean Dixon, New York City  
 Dr. Arnold B. Donawa, New York City  
 Aaron Douglas, Fisk University  
 Arnaud D'Usseau, New York City  
 Rev. Charles C. S. England, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Howard Fast, New York City  
 Frederick V. Field, New York City  
 Elinor S. Gimbel, New York City  
 Ben Gold, New York City  
 Kumar Goshal, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Shirley Graham, St. Albans, N. Y.  
 Percy Greene, Jackson, Miss.  
 Ewart Guinier, New York City.  
 Dashiell Hammett, New York City  
 William Harrison, Boston, Mass.  
 Rev. Dr. Wm. P. Hayes, Newark, N. J.  
 Donald Henderson, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Rev. Charles A. Hill, Detroit, Mich.  
 Velma Hopkins, Winston-Salem, N. C.  
 Rev. J. L. Horace, Chicago, Ill.  
 Charles H. Houston, Washington, D. C.  
 Charles P. Howard, Des Moines, Iowa  
 Rev. Kenneth de P. Hughes, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Langston Hughes, New York City  
 Dr. W. A. Hunton, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Ada B. Jackson, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Luther P. Jackson, Virginia State College  
 David Jenkins, California Labor School  
 Rev. C. Asapansa Johnson, Staten Island, N. Y.  
 Dr. R. O. Johnson, Atlanta, Ga.  
 Albert E. Kahn, Croton-on-Hudson, N. Y.  
 Rockwell Kent, Au Sable Forks, N. Y.  
 John Howard Lawson, San Fernando, Calif.  
 Ray Lev, New York City  
 Dorothy C. Lyman, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Albert Maltz, Los Angeles, Calif.  
 Dr. Cecil Marquez, New York City  
 George Marshall, New York City  
 Larkin Marshall, Macon, Ga.  
 Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, Morehouse College  
 Rev. Jack R. McMichael, New York City  
 John T. McMannus, New York City  
 Rev. Wm. Howard Melish, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Herbert T. Miller, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Willard Motley, Chicago, Ill.  
 Rev. Chas. C. Moulton, Panama  
 Capt. Hugh Mulzac, Jamaica, N. Y.  
 George B. Murphy, Jr., New York City  
 Estelle Massey Osborne, New York City  
 Rev. George L. Paine, Boston, Mass.  
 Father Clarence Parker, Chicago, Ill.  
 William L. Patterson, New York City  
 Dr. H. T. Penn, Roanoke, Va.  
 Dr. Charles A. Petioni, New York City  
 Martin Popper, New York City  
 Eslanda G. Robeson, Enfield, Conn.  
 Paul Robeson, New York City  
 Dr. E. J. Robinson, Los Angeles, Calif.  
 Rev. James H. Robinson, New York City  
 Therese L. Robinson, Washington, D. C.  
 O. John Rogge, New York City  
 Paul Schuur, San Francisco, Calif.  
 Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Williamstown, Mass.  
 Mrs. Andrew W. Simkins, Columbia, S. C.  
 Ferdinand C. Smith, New York City  
 Rev. Stephen G. Spottswood, Washington, D. C.  
 Max Steinberg, New York City  
 Dr. Bernhard J. Stern, New York City  
 Ella P. Stewart, Toledo, Ohio  
 Deems Taylor, New York City  
 Rebecca Stiles Taylor, Chicago, Ill.  
 Alma Vessells, New York City  
 Henry A. Wallace, South Salem, N. Y.  
 Bishop Wm. J. Walls, Chicago, Ill.  
 Dr. Edward K. Weaver, Texas College  
 Dr. Gene Weltfish, New York City  
 Dr. Charles H. Wesley, Wilberforce, Ohio  
 Lindsay White, New York City  
 Dr. J. Finley Wilson, Washington, D. C.

## EXHIBIT 39

## CALL TO A NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN POLICY IN CHINA AND THE FAR EAST

Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, January 23-25, 1948, Hotel Roosevelt, New York City

National Chairmen: T. A. Bisson, Dr. W. E. B. Dubois, Hon. Stanley M. Isaacs;  
Organizing Secretary Stephen H. Fritchman

"It is my considered opinion that future generations will regard the betrayal of the Chinese people by the American Government in the Truman administration as one of the greatest errors ever made in American diplomacy."—Brig. Gen. Evans F. Carlson, United States Marine Corps.

The three undersigned national chairmen call upon all interested organizations to send delegates and observers to a national conference on American policy in China and the Far East to be held in New York City, January 23, 24, and 25, 1948.

The purposes of the conference are to discuss and plan action on—

1. The halting of United States intervention in China and other friendly far eastern countries.
2. The carrying out of the democratic decisions of the Potsdam agreement and the Moscow conference regarding policies in Japan and Korea.
3. The relationship between far eastern policy and domestic well-being.
4. A program to achieve a genuinely democratic far eastern policy which alone can give any hope of peace.
5. Rallying all democratic Americans to support of such a program.

We Americans have always felt a pride and strength in our heritage as a democratic people. Our Government's present far eastern policy violates our most cherished American political beliefs and threatens our own democracy.

In China, the largest nation in earth, United States policy, through military, financial, and political intervention, is aiding in the imposition of a backward, corrupt and violently antidemocratic regime which the vast majority of the Chinese people themselves repudiate. The most reactionary elements in the United States are now scheming for further intervention on a scale which will subject the Chinese people to an autocracy dependent upon outside financial and military help—that is the United States—for its continued existence. This American intervention also violates the Charter of the United Nations.

In Japan, many observers, Americans and others, are deeply disturbed over the practically unilateral American occupation which seems less concerned about eradicating the reactionary elements responsible for Pearl Harbor than is now harnessing these elements to the dangerous ambitions of an antidemocratic American group.

In the Philippines, the American Government is giving energetic support to Filipino collaborationists and other betrayers of their country's independence; and by imposing upon the Philippines economic conditions inimical to their development as a free nation, is making a mockery of Philippine independence.

In Indonesia, the people struggling against their Dutch oppressors have been forsaken by an American policy evidently geared to safeguarding the status quo rather than to giving encouragement to those seeking freedom and a rising standard of living.

In southern Korea, where American occupation forces now rule over people who were our allies in the war, economic chaos and political fascism are the fruits of American policy.

The American democratic heritage and destiny is now suffering what may prove irrevocable damage from the present far-eastern policy of our Government. This policy is costing us taxpayers billions of futile dollars; it is postponing the healthy trans-Pacific trade we should be enjoying; it is creating conditions that contribute toward an economic depression here at home; it is fast making enemies of the millions of Asia who are our natural allies in the desire for a peaceful and democratic world; it is engendering international frictions which can easily lead us into another war.

It is time for democratic American citizens to act. In addition to organizational delegates and observers we invite individuals to attend as visitors.

This conference will bring together citizens who wish to secure the facts and understand the issues related to far eastern policy, and to discuss the means of

effective citizenship action on that policy. The conference will assist the delegates and individuals to carry back to their organizations and communities the facts, insights, convictions, and suggested methods of action necessary at this time. All decisions of the conference will come out of floor discussion and, we hope, will be implemented in whole or in part, by each organization in its own way.

T. A. BISSEON,  
W. E. B. DuBois,  
STANLEY M. ISAACS,  
*National Chairmen.*

## PROGRAM

## Friday, January 23

8 p. m.----- Conference mass meeting, City Center Casino, 135 West Fifty-fifth Street;  
Speakers: Anna Louise Strong, first hand report on the Far East, just returned from 1½ years in China and northern Korea; Dr. James G. Endicott, Toronto, recently returned China-born missionary for the United Church of Canada; Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell.

## Saturday, January 24

9-10 a. m.----- Registration of delegates and observers, and meeting of sponsors.  
10-12 m.----- Election of conference committee.  
Delegates' hour: Opportunity to present questions to experts on the Far East.  
Keynote address: Hugh Bryson, San Francisco.  
2-5 p. m.----- What is the United States doing in China?<sup>1</sup>  
8-10:30 p. m.----- What is the United States doing in colonial areas?<sup>1</sup>  
Dramatic presentation by Theater Workshop.

## Sunday, January 25

9:30-10:15 a. m.----- Memorial service for Brig. Gen. Evans F. Carlson, United States Marine Corps; address by Michael Straight, publisher, New Republic.  
10:15-12 m.----- What is the United States doing in Japan and Korea?<sup>1</sup>  
2-4:30 p. m.----- Report of conference committee; adoption of action program.  
Closing address: Paul Robeson.

## Adjournment.

Additional conference speakers include: Hugh DeLacy, Israel Epstein, Mark Gayn, and the three cochairmen, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, T. A. Bisson, and Stanley M. Isaacs. Further speakers will be announced.

## SPONSORS

(Partial listing)

Organizations are listed for the purpose of identification only. Such listing does not indicate sponsorship of the conference by these organizations

Louis Adamic, writer	Dr. Derk Bodde, University of Pennsylvania
Charlotte Adams, editor, Look magazine	Dr. Dwight Bradley, consulting psychologist
Dr. Thomas Addis, Leland Stanford University.	Joseph Brainen, chairman, American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists, and Scientists
Emily G. Balch, Nobel Peace Prize, 1946	Harry Bridges, president, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
C. B. Baldwin, executive vice-chairman, Progressive Citizens of America	Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown, president, Palmer Memorial Institute
S. L. M. Barlow, composer	Hugh Bryson, president, National Union Marine Cooks and Stewards
John W. Bicknell, writer on the Far East	Henrietta Buckmaster, writer
Charles Bidlen, executive secretary, American Committee for Free Indonesia	Angus Cameron, editor-in-chief, Little Brown & Co.
Dr. Algernon Black, executive leader, Ethical Culture Society	

<sup>1</sup> The major portion of these sessions will be devoted to delegates' discussions of positive action on far eastern policy.

Chu Tong, editor, China Daily News  
 Dr. Rufus E. Clement, president, Atlanta University  
 Rev. Donald B. Cloward, executive secretary, Council on Christian Social Progress  
 Dr. Clark Walker Cummings, executive secretary, Metropolitan Church Federation, St. Louis, Mo.  
 Dr. H. W. L. Dana, educator  
 Rev. John W. Darr, Jr., executive secretary, United Christian Council for Democracy  
 Frank Marshall Davis, assistant editor, Chicago Star  
 Hugh DeLacy, former United States Congressman  
 Mrs. Elliott Dexter, Encino, Calif.  
 John T. Doles, Jr., lawyer  
 Dorothy Doyle, nurse, recently with UNRRA in China  
 Muriel Draper, executive vice president, Congress of American Women  
 Barrows Dunham, writer  
 James Durkin, president, United Office and Professional Workers of America  
 Dr. Henry Pratt Fairchild, New York University  
 Frederick V. Field, writer  
 Olga Field, writer on the Far East  
 Dorothy Canfield Fisher, writer  
 Dr. Albert L. Franzke, University of Washington  
 Ben Gold, president, International Fur and Leather Workers Union  
 Ira Gollobin, chairman, American Veterans of the Philippine Campaign  
 Carlton B. Goodlett, president, San Francisco National Association for the Advancement of Colored People  
 Kumar Goshal, writer on India  
 Edmonia Grant, Associate Administrator, Southern Conference for Human Welfare  
 Dr. Ralph H. Gundlach, University of Washington  
 Uta Hagen, actress  
 Dr. Calvin S. Hall, Western Reserve University  
 Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, Smith College  
 William Harrison, associate editor, Boston Chronicle  
 Dr. A. Eustace Haydon, University of Chicago, Divinity School  
 Charlotte Honig, businesswoman  
 Leo Huberman, writer  
 Harold Ingalls, executive secretary, Student-Division, National YMCA  
 Philip Jaffe, publisher, Amerasia Associates  
 Dr. Rufus M. Jones, Haverford College  
 Phillip O. Keeney, libraries officer, Supreme Command Allied Powers in Japan  
 Dr. J. Spencer Kennard, educator, former Baptist missionary to Japan and China  
 Dr. Raymond Kennedy, Yale University  
 Morris E. Kriensky, artist  
 Dr. John H. Lathrop, Church of the Saviour, Brooklyn  
 Richard E. Lauterbach, editor, the Magazine '47  
 Harold Leventhal, chairman, American Friends of India  
 Dr. Alain Locke, Howard University  
 Rev. Jack R. McMichael, executive secretary, Methodist Federation for Social Action  
 Albert Maltz, writer  
 Dr. William Mandel, writer  
 George Marshall, chairman, board of directors, Civil Rights Congress  
 Dr. Kirtley F. Mather, Harvard University  
 Dr. H. T. Medford, secretary, Foreign Missions, A. M. E. Zion Church  
 Dr. Clyde R. Miller, Teachers College, Columbia University  
 Kate L. Mitchell, writer on the Far East  
 Bernard J. Mooney, upstate New York, regional director, United Office and Professional Workers of America  
 Rev. Richard Morford, executive director, National Council of American-Soviet Friendship  
 Bishop Arthur W. Moulton, Protestant Episcopal Church  
 Grant W. Onkes, president, Farm Equipment Workers Union  
 Patrick H. O'Brien, judge of probate, Wayne County, Mich.  
 Mrs. Jessie L. O'Connor, Fort Worth, Tex.  
 Dr. Ernest Osborne, Columbia University  
 Bishop Edward Parsons, Protestant Episcopal Church  
 Robert Payne, writer on the Far East  
 Dr. Arthur Upham Pope, chancellor, Asia Institute  
 Martin Popper, board of directors, National Lawyer's Guild  
 Dr. Edwin McNeill Poterat, president, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School  
 Phelps Putman, poet.  
 Dr. Walter Rautenstrauch, educator  
 Dr. Raymond Robins, social economist  
 Holland Roberts, director, California Labor School  
 Paul Robeson, concert singer  
 Nathaniel L. Rock, lawyer  
 Sidney Roger, radio commentator, CIO  
 Edward Rohrbough, writer on the Far East  
 Walter Rosenblum, president, Photo League



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Maud Russell, executive director, Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy | Dr. Bernhard J. Stern, Columbia University  |
| Rose Russell, legislative director, Teachers Union                              | Martha Dodd Stern, writer   |
| Dr. W. Carson Ryan, University of North Carolina                                | Annalee Stewart, president, U. S. Section, Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom |
| Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, Williams College                                      | Paul Strand, artist   |
| Arthur Schutzer, New York City  | Frank E. Taylor, editor, Random House   |
| Dr. Vida D. Scudder, Wellesley College  | Dr. Donald G. Tewksbury, Columbia University  |
| Bernard Seeman, writer on the Far East  | Dr. Rexford G. Tugwell, University of Chicago   |
| Joseph P. Selly, president, American Communications Association                 | Jeanette Turner, executive secretary, New York City Consumer Council                          |
| Rev. Guy Emery Shipley, editor, The Churchman                                   | Olive Van Horn, secretary for administrative affairs, National YWCA                           |
| Elie Siegmeister, composer  | Rev. Edgar M. Wahlberg, formerly with UNRRA in China  |
| Harold G. Slingerland, chairman, Channing County American Labor Party           | Dr. Harry F. Ward, writer   |
| Dr. Maud Slye, University of Chicago  | Charles Weidman, dancer   |
| Agnes Smedley, writer on the Far East   | Dr. Gene Weltfish, Columbia University  |
| Christine B. Smith, president, National Association of Colored Women            | Dr. Charles H. Wesley, president, Wilberforce State College                                   |
| Ferdinand C. Smith, secretary, national Maritime Union                          | Howard Willard, artist  |
| Mrs. Edgar Snow, writer on the Far East   | Dr. James M. Williams, Hobart College   |
| Johannes Steel, publisher, Johannes Steel Newsletter                            | Ella Winter, writer   |
| Dr. Harry C. Steinmetz, San Diego State College                                 | Justice James H. Wolfe, Supreme Court, State of Utah  |
|   | Richard Yaffe, writer   |
|   | Victor A. Yakhontoff, writer  |
|   | William Zorach, sculptor  |

We urge immediate registration.

CONFERENCE APPLICATION

Name..... Address.....  
 I am an individual visitor ----- Organizational delegate ----- Appointed  
 observer -----  
 Organization represented -----  
 Indicate whether: National ----- State ----- Local -----  
 Enclosed is \$..... for registration fee (\$3 per delegate)

Admission to single sessions (morning, afternoon, or evening) \$1  
 Address requests for housing accommodations to organizing secretary  
 Contributions in support of the conference are invited  
 Address all communications to: The Organizing Secretary, Far Eastern Conference, 111 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y., LONguere 4-3943.

EXHIBIT 40

URGENT SUMMONS TO A CONGRESS ON CIVIL RIGHTS IN DETROIT, APRIL 27 AND 28, 1946, TO ORGANIZE AN OFFENSIVE AGAINST THE RISING FASCIST AGGRESSION IN THE UNITED STATES

Today's drive to subvert our democratic liberties is well-organized, well-heelcd, insidious. It presents an emergency that emergency measures alone can meet. The great war against fascism is won, but the victory is far from secure. Only a coalition of all the forces of the people, through united action, can prevent its destruction.

Here's what is happening in the United States:

PROGRAM

*Congress on civil rights, Detroit, Mich., April 27 and 28, 1946*

Saturday morning, First Congregational Church (Woodward Avenue at Forest):  
 11 a. m., registration.  
 12 noon, opening luncheon.

Saturday afternoon, 2 p. m. to 6 p. m., Maccabees Auditorium (Woodward Avenue at Putnam):

Defense Against the Enemy Within—Presentation of key issues.  
 Protect Minorities for America's Defense—The fight against police terror in Columbia, Tenn., the Freeport killings, and other widespread violation of civil rights; results of campaigns on these cases.  
 Labor's Rights—First Line of Defense—The fight against the Case bill, police violence, the Injunction menace  
 Crush America's Fifth Column—The fight against the Rankin committee, Gerald L. K. Smith, the KKK, Bilbo and all domestic fascists.  
 The Menace of anti-Semitism and Jim Crow—The fight against terrorism, and discrimination in employment, housing, and education.  
 Initial report of resolutions committee; report of credentials committee; election of campaigns coordination committee.

Saturday evening, 8:30 p. m., reception for delegates by Michigan Civil Rights Federation.

Sunday, 9:30 a. m. to 3:30 p. m.:

Report of campaigns coordination committee. Discussion of proposals.  
 Luncheon recess.  
 Continued discussion and action on committee report.  
 Final report of resolutions committee.  
 Proposals for carrying out conference decisions.

Conference Headquarters: 609 Hammond Building, Fort and Woodward Avenues, Detroit. Telephone: Cadillac 6278.

Registration: At First Congregational Church from 11 a. m. to 2 p. m. on Saturday. After 2 p. m., at Maccabees auditorium. Registration fee: \$2 for each organization delegate, or individual.

Representation: Two representatives from each organization; interested individuals.

Conference luncheon: Saturday noon, at First Congressional Church. Reservations may be made at \$1.50 per plate. Please make reservations in advance. Luncheon speakers to be announced.

Accommodations: Reservations for hotel accommodations must be made in advance because of housing difficulties. Address all requests for reservations to New York headquarters of Congress on Civil Rights. For further details, additional copies of this call and general inquiry, send all communications to:

Congress on Civil Rights, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Reactionary forces, based on war-rich monopolies, the die-hard union breakers, red-baiters, and race haters, command the largest surviving fifth column in the world. They are turning the weapons and methods of fascism against the American people. They are prepared to destroy our democracy, even to the establishment of outright fascism.

Their program consists of smashing unions through strike provocation, injunctions, and legislation like the Case bill that would wipe out labor gains of a quarter of a century; spreading discrimination and hatred against minorities through violence against Negro civilians and veterans, particularly in the South, anti-Semitism and destruction of FEPC; maintaining the poll-tax system to disfranchise 10,000,000 Negro and white Americans; sapping the strength of labor and other organizations by using Hitler's prime weapon of red baiting, especially through revival of the Dies committee under Rankin.

This reactionary program has met the growing organized resistance of the labor movement and other groups and individuals who believe firmly in democratic liberties.

The popular response to such campaigns as FEPC and poll-tax repeal shows that the people will organize. Veterans are fighting discrimination and challenging the pro-Fascist press. Committees everywhere have sprung up to defend victims of police and lynch violence; the renewed activity of such Fascist spokesmen as Gerald L. K. Smith has brought widespread, fighting protests.

Labor has sharply stiffened the defense of its civil rights, and people in all walks of life are rallying with enthusiasm to labor's defense.

Now more than ever the united action of the democratic forces is needed to enable each organization and individual to exert maximum effectiveness in the realization of a common program. The elaboration of a campaign or series of

campaigns, coordinated in detail and Nation-wide in scope, is therefore essential to meet the challenges that today confront us all:

To safeguard and extend all democratic rights, especially the rights of labor, and of racial, political, religious and national minorities;

To combat all forms of discrimination against these groups;

To defend and aid victims of the fight for these rights;

To fight against domestic fascism and all its forms—Jim Crow, anti-Semitism, red-baiting, discrimination against the foreign born.

To these ends, we call upon civil rights, labor, religious, interracial, and other organizations and individuals to attend a congress on civil rights in Detroit on April 27 and 28, 1946, to formulate and agree upon a national program to defeat the offensive of reactionary and Fascist forces, and to consider all steps required to assure the maximum unification of effort to advance that program.

#### INITIATING COMMITTEE

Zlatko Balokovic, vice president, American Slav Congress	International Labor Defense
Elmer A. Benson, chairman, executive council, National Citizens PAC	George Marshall, chairman, National Federation Constitutional Liberties
Mary McLeod Bethune	Dr. Kirtley F. Mather
Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown, president, Palmer Institute.	Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College
Col. Evans Carlson	Bishop Edward L. Parsons
Edward Chodorov	James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union
Norman Corwin	Dr. Edwin McNeill Potent, president, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School
Julius Emspak, secretary-treasurer, United Electric, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO	Paul Robeson
Jess Fletcher, vice president, Building Service Employees International Union, AFL	Edward G. Robinson
Clark Foreman, president, Southern Conference for Human Welfare	Wesley E. Sharer, co-chairman, Chicago Civil Liberties Committee
Carey McWilliams	Prof. John F. Shepard, president, Michigan Civil Rights Federation
Rep. Vito Marcantonio, president, In-	Johannes Steel
	Donald Ogden Stewart
	Milton Kaufman, executive secretary

#### SPONSORS

(Partial list)

Louis Adamic	Rev. Shelton Hale Bishop, New York City
Meyer Adelman, district director, United Steelworkers, Milwaukee	Judge Jane M. Bolin, New York City
Raymond Pace Alexander	H. D. Bollinger, secretary, Department of Student Work, Board of Education, Methodist Church
James Egert Allen, president, New York State Conference NAACP Branches	Rev. W. Russel Bowie
Rep. Charles W. Anderson, Kentucky State Legislature	Louis E. Burnham, organizing secretary, Southern Negro Youth Congress.
Judge William A. Anderson, Minneapolis	D. A. Cameron, editor, Little, Brown & Co.
Susan B. Anthony II, secretary, Congress of American Women	Councilman Charles N. Carr, Cleveland Del. Castle, Ship Scalers Union, local 589
Elmer J. F. Arndt, chairman, Commission Christian Social Action, Evangelical and Reformed Church	Rose Mae Catchings, president, Southern Negro Youth Congress
Bishop James C. Baker, Los Angeles	Prof. Emmanuel Chapman, chairman, Commission of Catholics for Human Rights
C. B. Baldwin, executive vice president, National Citizens PAC	Dr. Rufus E. Clement, president, Atlanta University
Howard Bay, president, United Scenic Artists Local 829	Dean Nick Comfort, Oklahoma School of Religion
W. A. Bell, president, Miles College	Phillip M. Connelly, secretary, Los Angeles CIO Council
Lewis Alan Berne, president, Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians	
Warren K. Billings	

Councilman Eugene P. Connolly, New York City  
 A. A. Couch, president, Iowa Federation of Labor  
 Julius Crane, vice president, United Shoe Workers  
 George W. Crockett, Jr., executive director, Fair Practices Committee, UAW-CIO  
 Joseph Curran, president, National Maritime Union  
 Councilman Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., New York City  
 Adolph Dehn  
 Rep. Hugh De Lacy, Washington  
 Hon. Earl B. Dickerson, president, National Bar Association  
 Catherine Dunham  
 Roscoe Dunjee  
 N. H. Eagle, director of organization, United Rubber Workers  
 Prof. R. D. Feld, Tulane University  
 Lion Feuchtwanger  
 Elizabeth Gurley Flynn  
 Eleanor Fowler, secretary, Congress of Women's Auxiliaries  
 Stephen H. Fritchman, editor, Christian Register  
 Leo Gallagher, Los Angeles  
 John Garfield  
 Sander Genis, manager, Twin City Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers  
 Elinor S. Gimbel, New York City  
 Leonard Golditch, secretary, National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism  
 Rabbi Solomon Goldman, Chicago  
 L. A. Gossett, secretary, Georgia State CIO Council  
 Bishop J. A. Gregg, Kansas City, Kans.  
 Abner Green, secretary, American Commission for Protection of Foreign Born  
 Mel J. Heinritz, secretary, Wisconsin State CIO Council  
 Donald Henderson, president, Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers  
 Rev. Charles A. Hill, president, Detroit NAACP  
 James A. Hinton, president, State Conference of NAACP for South Carolina  
 Langston Hughes  
 Rev. Kenneth deP. Hughes, president, Boston NAACP  
 Hosea Hudson, local president, United Steel Workers, Birmingham  
 Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, chairman, Justice and Peace Committee, Central Conference of American Rabbis  
 Dr. D. V. Jemison, president, National Baptist Convention  
 Dr. Rufus M. Jones, Haverford, Pa.  
 J. F. Jurich, president, International Fishermen and Allied Workers  
 Millard Lampell  
 Ring W. Lardner, Jr.  
 Kenneth Leslie, editor, The Protestant  
 A. A. Liveright, executive director, American Council on Race Relations  
 Arthur Le Sueur, Duluth, Minn.  
 Bishop Francis J. McConnell  
 Prof. Edward W. McFarland, president, Metropolitan Council FEP, Detroit  
 O. E. McKaine, secretary, Progressive Democratic Party, South Carolina  
 Rev. Jack R. McMichael, secretary, Methodist Federation for Social Service  
 Herbert March, district director, United Packinghouse Workers, Chicago  
 Prof. F. O. Matthieson, Harvard University  
 Samuel D. Menin, Denver, Colo.  
 Lewis Merrill, president, United Office and Professional Workers  
 Saul Mills, secretary, New York CIO Council  
 Dr. George S. Mitchell, director, Veterans Service, Southern Regional Council  
 J. P. Mooney, organizer, Textile Workers Union, Bessemer, Ala.  
 Morris Muster, president, United Furniture Workers  
 Tom Nell, executive secretary, Servicemen's and Veterans' Welfare Committee, UERWMA  
 Josephine Nordstrand, secretary, Wisconsin State Conference on Social Legislation  
 Grant W. Oakes, president, United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers  
 Rep. Ellis E. Patterson, California  
 Boyd E. Payton, president, Virginia State CIO Council  
 Dr. Charles A. Petioni, chairman, West Indies National Council  
 Terry Pettus, president, Washington State CIO-PAC  
 Irving Potash, manager, Furriers Joint Council, New York  
 Rep. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., New York City  
 Lea Pressman, general counsel, Congressman of Industrial Organizations  
 Councilman Michael J. Quill, president, Transport Workers Union  
 Thomas C. Rabbitt, Washington State senator  
 Mervyn Rathborne, secretary, California State CIO Council  
 Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch, Columbia University  
 Earl Robinson  
 Reid Robinson, president, International Union, Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers  
 Dorothy K. Roosevelt, executive secretary, Michigan Citizens Committee  
 Rep. William A. Rowan, Illinois  
 Rep. Charles R. Savage, Washington

William Jay Schieffelin	Senator Glen H. Taylor, Idaho
Prof. A. M. Schlesinger, Harvard University	Rep. Donald C. Teigland, Illinois State Legislature
Artur Schnabel	W. E. Tucker, president, Local 157, International Union of Brewery Workers, Dallas, Tex.
Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Williams College	Prof. Ralph E. Wager, Emory University
Joseph P. Selly, president, American Communications Association	Dr. Harry F. Ward
Henry R. Silberman, executive director, New England Division, American Jewish Congress	Courtney D. Ward, secretary, Painters District Council, Cleveland
Charles N. Smolkoff, director, Florida State CIO Council	Max Weber
Herbert K. Sorrell, president, Conference of Studio Unions, AFL	Lulu B. White, secretary, Houston, Tex., NAACP
Christina Stead	Rev. Claude C. Williams, director, People's Institute of Applied Religion
Max Sein, secretary, Cincinnati CIO Council	James H. Wolfe, Justice, State Supreme Court, Utah
A. E. Stevenson, secretary, Cleveland CIO Council	Bishop R. R. Wright, Jr., secretary, Fraternal Council of Negro Churches
Prof. Dirk J. Struik, Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Dr. Max Yergan, president, National Negro Congress
Glenn J. Talbot, president, North Dakota Farmers Union	Jack Zeller, educational director, UAW-CIO

NOTE.—Organizations listed for identification only.

EXHIBIT 41

APRIL 7, 1948.

*Schuman signs this.*

A STATEMENT OF AMERICAN EDUCATORS

As American educators, we are much disturbed by one of the byproducts of the Presidential "loyalty order"—the listing of a number of schools as "subversive" organizations by the Attorney General of the United States. The charge that these schools "appear" to be "adjuncts of the Communist Party" could be made against any institution that teaches Marxism, and could thus always be used as a device for labeling Marxist teaching subversive.

We may or may not believe in Marxist schools, Catholic schools, single-tax schools, or any other schools with particular social outlooks. We are alarmed that any official of the American Government assumes the power officially to proclaim the teaching and study of an economic philosophy to be subversive.

We believe that every group—including Marxists—has the right, under the American Constitution, to teach and propagate its ideas, and that students, whether they are Marxists or not, have the right to study Marxism and to judge for themselves the validity of its teachings. If this right can be denied by arbitrary government fiat—in the sense that teaching at or attending a school where such ideas are taught is declared "subversive"—then similarly any other ideas not approved by those in power can as readily be stifled.

We recognize, for example, that the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York is, in its teaching of the social sciences, avowedly Marxist. It operates as an independent institution under its board of trustees, and clearly defines its educational objectives and organization in its bulletins. Whatever one might think of Marxism as a method or a body of doctrine, it is clear that the action of the Attorney General in stigmatizing such institutions as "subversive," especially without hearing or trial, represents an extremely dangerous step in the direction of thought control and the institution of thought police. If Marxist schools can be declared subversive, then social science teachers who assign Marxist materials or express Marxist views may quickly be subjected to the same label. Freedom of inquiry will be gravely imperiled.

The President's Commission on Higher Education for American Democracy (December 15, 1947) has ably stated: "The social role of education in a democratic society is at once to insure equal liberty and equal opportunity to differing individuals and groups, and to enable the citizens to understand, appraise, and redirect forces, men, and events as these tend to strengthen or to weaken their liberties."

In this spirit, we ask that the President of the United States and the Attorney General withdraw the blacklist of Marxist and labor educational institutions, as repugnant to our national ideal of freedom of thought.

## SIGNERS OF STATEMENT OF AMERICAN EDUCATORS

Professor	Institution (for identification only)
Thomas Addis.....	Stanford University.
Edward S. Allan.....	Iowa State College.
Russell Ames.....	Queens College.
Earl Maynard Aris.....	Albion College.
Francis M. Barbour.....	Southern Illinois University.
Fred Asa Barnes.....	Cornell (retired).
Ralph Beals.....	University of California at Los Angeles.
Edward Biberman.....	
Leonard Bloomfield.....	Yale University.
Cornellus Bol.....	Stanford (retired).
Earl C. Bowman.....	De Pauw University
Lyman R. Bradley.....	New York University.
Theodore Brameld.....	Do.
Joseph Bressler.....	Brooklyn College.
Dorothy Brewster.....	Columbia University.
John Bridge.....	City College of New York.
Arthur G. Brodeur.....	University of California.
Charles N. Brooks.....	Harvard University.
William B. Bryan.....	Macalester College, Minnesota.
Edwin Berry Burgum.....	New York University.
John L. Buys.....	St. Lawrence University.
Robert Chambers.....	New York University (retired).
Charles M. Child.....	Stanford University.
Edith F. Clafin.....	Columbia University.
Edwin L. Clarke.....	Rollins College.
Willson L. Coates.....	Sarah Lawrence College.
M. Robert Cobbletick.....	Connecticut College.
Joseph W. Cohen.....	University of Colorado.
Philip W. L. Cox.....	New York University.
Oliver C. Cox.....	Tuskegee Institute.
Grace L. Coyle.....	Western Reserve University.
Abraham Cronbach.....	Hebrew Union College.
Dean W. C. Curtis.....	University of Missouri (emeritus).
John J. De Boer.....	University of Illinois.
Harl Douglass.....	Director, School of Education, University of Colorado.
H. M. Doutt.....	University of Akron.
Arnold Dresden.....	Swarthmore College.
W. E. B. DuBois.....	National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
Lyford P. Edwards.....	Bard College.
Franklin Edgerton.....	Yale Law School.
Thomas D. Elliot.....	Northwestern University.
Albert I. Elkus.....	University of California.
Thomas I. Emerson.....	Yale University.
Bergen Evans.....	Northwestern University.
Frederic Ewen.....	Brooklyn College.
Henry Pratt Fairchild.....	New York University.
Philip S. Foner.....	Jefferson School.
Abraham Edel.....	City College of New York.
Frances A. Foster.....	Vassar College.
Royal W. France.....	Rollins College.
Harold A. Freeman.....	Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Reginald F. French.....	Amherst College.
Henrietta V. Friedman.....	Hunter College.
Wendell H. Furry.....	Harvard University.
David B. Goodard.....	University of Pennsylvania.
Erwin B. Goodenough.....	Yale University.
Ralph H. Gundlach.....	University of Washington.
Calvin S. Hall.....	Western Reserve University.

## SIGNERS OF STATEMENT OF AMERICAN EDUCATORS—continued

Professor	Institution (for identification only)
Victor E. Hall	Stanford University.
R. Travis Hardaway	Queens College.
Harrison Harley	Simmons College.
Virginia Harlow	De Pauw University.
Robert J. Havighust	University of Chicago.
Harold Haydon	Do.
G. A. Hedger	University of Cincinnati (retired).
Virgil B. Heltzel	Northwestern University.
J. Allen Hickerson	New Haven State Teachers College.
Philip M. Hicks	Swarthmore.
Ernest R. Hilgard	Stanford University.
Stefan Hirsch	Bard College.
Harry Hoijer	University of California at Los Angeles.
Hamilton Holt	President, Rollins College.
Harold Hotelling	University of North Carolina.
Abbott G. Houk	St. Lawrence University.
Abbott Kaplan	University of California at Los Angeles.
Forrest M. Keen	Heidelberg College.
Raymond Kennedy	Yale.
Walter B. Keighton	Swarthmore.
C. Wendell King	Rollins College.
Paul Kirkpatrick	Stanford University.
Samuel Kliger	Duke University.
John I. Kolehmainen	Heidelberg College.
Luther P. Jackson	Virginia State College.
William Jaffe	Northwestern University.
Harold N. Lee	Tulane University.
Paul L. Lehmann	Princeton Theological Seminary.
Norman Levinson	Mass. Institute of Technology.
Alton A. Lindsey.	
Gerhard Loose	University of Colorado.
Chaplain Sidney Lovett	Yale.
Robert S. Lynd	Columbia.
Curtiss MacDougall	Northwestern University.
New MacMinn	Do.
Wilfred H. Mainwaring	Stanford University (emeritus).
Luther B. Marchant	Mills College.
John M. Marsalka	Yale.
F. O. Matthlessen	Harvard University.
Wesley H. Maurer	University of Michigan.
Kenneth O. May.	
Henry L. McClintock	University of Minnesota Law School.
V. J. McGill.	
J. F. Mack	Oberlin College.
Kirtley F. Mather	Harvard.
Clyde Miller	Columbia.
Ermina Mills	De Pauw University.
Julia Neely	Southern Illinois University.
Arthur H. Nethercot	Northwestern University.
Robert Hastings Nichols	Union Theological Seminary (emeritus).
F. S. C. Northrop	Yale.
Michael Pargment	University of Michigan.
Ralph Barton Perry	Harvard (emeritus).
John P. Peters	New Haven, Conn.
Edith Phillips	Swarthmore.
Herbert J. Phillips	University of Washington.
Frank W. Pitman	Pomona College (emeritus).
Walter Rautenstrauch	Columbia (emeritus).
Ira De A. Reid	Atlanta University.
George F. Reynolds	University of Colorado (emeritus).
Sarah R. Riedman	Brooklyn College.
Bernard F. Riess	Hunter College.
Holland Roberts	California Labor School.
Theodore Rosebury	Columbia University.

## SIGNERS OF STATEMENT OF AMERICAN EDUCATORS—continued

Professor	Institution (for identification only)
Alexander Sandow.....	New York University.
Margaret Schlauch.....	Do.
Frederick L. Schuman.....	Williams College.
Agner H. Schroeder.....	Western Reserve University.
Walter Sliz.....	Swarthmore.
Harry Slochower.....	Brooklyn College.
William C. Smith.....	Linfield College.
Willard Smith.....	Mills College.
James D. Sorber.....	Swarthmore.
Bertha K. Stavrianos.....	Roosevelt College of Chicago.
Bernard J. Stern.....	Columbia.
Dirk J. Struik.....	Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Ernest L. Talbert.....	University of Cincinnati.
Williametta C. Thomson.....	Syracuse University.
Miriam D. Thompkins.....	Columbia.
Charles Trinkaus.....	Sarah Lawrence College.
William Lewis Troyer.....	Albion College.
Rexford Guy Tugwell.....	University of Chicago.
Colston E. Warne.....	Amherst College.
Edward K. Weaver.....	Alabama State Teachers College.
David L. Webster.....	Stanford University.
Charles H. Wesley.....	President, Wilberforce University.
Louis Weisner.....	Hunter College.
F. W. Weymouth.....	Stanford University.
George F. Whicher.....	Amherst College.
Samuel K. Workman.....	Northwestern University.
Henry N. Wieman.....	University of Chicago.
Edward H. Zabriskie.....	Rutgers University.
Thomas Woody.....	University of Pennsylvania.
Eugene C. Holmes.....	Howard University.
Stuart Mudd.....	University of Pennsylvania Medical School.

## EXHIBIT 42

TO HONOR A GREAT AMERICAN ON THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF HIS COURAGEOUS  
LAUNCHING OF THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

You are cordially invited to join us in honoring Henry A. Wallace, a great leader and a wonderful human being at a dinner, at the Hotel Astor, New York City, Monday evening, September 12, 1949, at 7 o'clock.

Couvert: \$10—dress optional.

R. S. V. P.

TED O. THACKREY, *Dinner Chairman.*

Three years ago, a man of courage and principle and great concern for his fellow man raised his voice against what he regarded as a betrayal of the people.

His conscience aflame, he spoke up, at Madison Square Garden, on September 12, 1946, against the drift away from the Roosevelt path of peace and cooperation.

He did this at great personal sacrifice. Just as 2 years earlier when his denunciation of Jim Crow at the Democratic National Convention cost him the Presidency, so now his Jeremiah-like warning led inevitably to his resignation from the Cabinet a few days later.

On that September 12, Henry A. Wallace launched, and has since led with magnificent integrity, the resistance movement that has given organized expression to the peace forces of America. Some day this movement will be judged in true perspective and all who have participated in it will have reason to be proud.

Funds from this dinner will be used to further Mr. Wallace's great work as the leader of the Progressive Party.



## DINNER SPONSORS

John Abt	Prof. Thomas I. Emerson	Paul J. Kern
Jacob L. Aisenberg	Lion Feuchtwanger	Charles M. Kerns, Jr.
Helen L. Alfred	Frederick V. Field	Dr. John A. Kingsbury
Oliver S. Allen	Thomas Fitzpatrick	Hannah Kirtz
Irving Andors	Russell H. Fluent	Harry G. Kriegel
Robenia Anthony	Clark Foreman	Leo Krzycki
I. Duke Avnet	Clemens J. France	Corliss Lamont
Homer Ayres	Lew Frank, Jr.	Millard Lampell
C. B. Baldwin	Patricia Murphy Frank	Marjorie Lansing
Verda Barnes	Prof. Mitchell Franklin	Karly Larsen
Prof. Cyrus P. Barnum, Jr.	Dr. Richard A. Freedman	John La Touche
Mrs. Moses Barron	Dr. Asa B. Friedman	Arthur Laurents
Dr. Edward K. Barsky	Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman	James D. Le Cron
Henry Beitscher	William S. Gallmor	Canada Lee
Dr. Vincent Bellaflore	Mrs. William S. Gallmor	Ray Lev
David Beloff	Zalmon Garfield	Grace K. Liebman
Elmer A. Benson	A. J. Gelb	Irma Lindheim
Irving Berke	Zina Getmansky	Seymour Linfield
Mrs. Irving Berke	Elinor S. Gimbel	Alice F. Liveright
Victor Bernstein	Kaye Ginsberg	Stan Loney
Walter Bernstein	J. W. Gitt	Michael Loring
Edwin Bjorkman	Mrs. J. W. Gitt	Dr. Oliver S. Loud
Dr. Algernon Black	Ben Gold	Thomas Ludwig
Morton Bloom	Fred F. Gold	Prof. Curtis D.
Millen Brand	B. Z. Goldberg	MacDougall
Prof. Dorothy Brewster	Mrs. Louis Goldburt	Bernard Z.
Harry Bridges	Minnie Golden	McGrogarty
Hugh Bryson	Sanford L. Goldman	John T. McManus
Harold Buchman	Dr. Samuel M. Goodman	Mary Cabot Macy
Dr. Robert K. Burns	Esther Lowe Gordon	Albert Maltz
Rev. Dudley H. Burr	Jack Greenbaum	Vito Marcantonio
Dr. Allan M. Butler	William Gropper	James Martin
Angus Cameron	Ewart G. Guinier	John Martin
Dr. Ulysses Campbell	Uta Hagen	Winfred L. Martindale
Dr. John E. T. Camper	Vincent Hallinan	Mary Bacon Mason
Herman Cherry	Mrs. Vincent Hallinan	Prof. F. O. Matthiessen
Jerome Chodorov	Dashiel Hammett	Dr. Leo Mayer
John M. Coe	E. Y. Harburg	Mrs. Leo Mayer
Louis Cohen	Mrs. E. Y. Harburg	Rev. William Howard
Charles A. Collins	Dr. Fowler Harper	Melish
Fannie Cook	Dr. Marion Hathway	Arthur Miller
Israel Cramer	Dorothy Haven	Clyde R. Miller
Prof. Henry W. Longfellow	Lillian Hellman	William H. Miller
Dana	Donald Henderson	Dimitri Mitropoulos
Francis Danowski	Erma L. Henderson	Mrs. Albert Mizzy
Zoltan Deak	Edith Well Hertz	Thomas G. Moore
John J. DeBoer	Rev. Charles A. Hill	Elizabeth Moos
Hugh De Lacy	Ira A. Hirschmann	Jacob Moscovitz
Raymond Dennis	Charles P. Howard	Stanley Moss
Freda Diamond	Leo Huberman	Rev. Arthur W.
Harry L. Diehl	Rev. Kenneth deP. Hughes	Moulton
Martha Dodd	James Imbrie	Russell Nixon
Dr. Barnet Dorwitt	Jeremiah C. Ingersoll	Grant W. Oakes
Olin Downes	Minneola P. Ingersoll	Walter O'Brien
Muriel Draper	Leo Isacson	Jerry J. O'Connell
Paul Draper	Rev. J. Quinton Jackson	Ernest Thor Olson
Mrs. Paul Draper	Crockett Johnson	Orville Olson
Benjamin Dreyfus	Walter E. Johnson	Harry C. Oppenheimer
Dr. W. E. B. DuBois	Alvin Jones	Mrs. Harry C. Oppenheimer
Prof. Barrows Dunham	Dr. Harry Joseph	Sona Osato
James H. Durkin	Robert Josephy	Estelle Massey Osborne
Arnaud d'Usseau	Mrs. Robert Josephy	Arthur Osman
Dr. Lewis A. Eldridge, Jr.	Elinor Kahn	
Kyrle Elkin	Manya Kahn	
Dr. Robert H. Ellis	Rockwell Kent	

Dr. Lionel Ovesey	Norman Rosten	Elsie H. Tyndale
Meyer Parodneck	Dr. John F. Rutledge	Louis Untermeyer
Robert Patterson	Lee Sablison	Mary Van Kleeck
Dr. Linus Pauling	Dr. Artur Schnabel	Katherine Van Orden
William Pennock	Prof. Frederick L. Schuman	Craig Vincent
Jennings Perry	Arthur Schutzer	William Vulcan
Nels Peterson	Dr. Benjamin Segal	Dr. Alexander J. Walker
Morris Pizer	Joseph P. Selly	Courtney Ward
Ely Pollack	Theodore Shapiro	Dr. Harry F. Ward
A. L. Pomerantz	Agnes Smedley	Alice H. Ware
Martin Popper	Dr. Randolph B. Smith	Goldie Watson
Prof. Edward A. Post	Raphael Soyer	Dr. William H. Watts
George Provost	Mrs. Lawrence D. Steefel	Max Weber
Harry Ragozin	Johannes Steel	Dr. Gene Weltfish
Mrs. Harry Ragozin	Boris R. Steinberg	Mrs. Louis Wender
Willard B. Ransom	Alfred K. Stern	Prof. Frank W. Weymouth
Bernard Reswick	I. F. Stone	Rev. Elliot White
Libby Holman Reynolds	Fred W. Stover	Mrs. Elliot White
Dr. John G. Rideout	Frieda Strassler	Henry Willcox
Paul Robeson	Dr. Dirk J. Strulk	Mrs. Henry Willcox
Eslanda Goode Robeson	Paul M. Sweezy	James Waterman Wise
Col. Raymond Robins	Helen Taulris	Bert Witt
Earl Robinson	Dr. I. M. Tarlov	Alexander Wright
Reid Robinson	Dr. Alva W. Taylor	Herman Wright
Sidney Roger	Mandel A. Terman	George Wuchnich
O. John Rogge	P. Frankel Thau	Coleman Young
Harold J. Rome	Jacob Turner	Joseph Zwilling
Dr. Samuel Rosen	Mrs. Jacob Turner	Mrs. Joseph Zwilling
Mrs. Samuel Rosen	Jerry Tyler	
Paul L. Ross		

## EXHIBIT 43

[Bureau of Academic Freedom, National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, 49 West Forty-fourth Street, New York 18 (Johanna Grant)]

For release Tuesday, March 1, 1949.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY LEADING EDUCATORS CALL FOR REINSTATEMENT OF UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PROFESSORS

LETTERS TO DR. ALLEN CALLS FIRING'S THREAT TO ENTIRE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

One hundred and fifty educational leaders from more than 50 colleges and universities throughout the country have urged Dr. Raymond Allen, president of the University of Washington, to reinstate with full rights of tenure the 3 professors recently discharged from the university for membership in or "ambiguous relationship to" the Communist Party in a letter released today (Tuesday) by the Bureau of Academic Freedom of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Dr. Christian Gauss, dean emeritus of Princeton University; Prof. L. C. Dunn of Columbia University; Dr. L. B. Arguinbau, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Howard Mumford Jones, of Harvard University; and Prof. Robert Chambers, of New York University, are among the signers of the letter which characterizes the firings as a "shocking repudiation" of the principles of democracy and academic freedom.

Other signatures to the letter, which has also been sent to the board of regents of the University of Washington, include: Dr. David Haber, Yale Law School; Prof. Colston Warne, Amherst College; Dr. Harl R. Douglass, director of the College of Education, University of Colorado; Dr. Frank W. Weymouth, Stanford University; Prof. Joseph F. Fletcher, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge; Dr. W. C. H. Prentice of Swarthmore College; Dr. I. M. Kolthoff, University of Minnesota; and Dr. T. W. Reese, Mount Holyoke College.

Following is the complete text of the letter, released by Dr. Clyde R. Miller, director of the NCASP Bureau on Academic Freedom:

"The principle that every citizen has a right to his personal beliefs and associations and to voluntary participation in the affairs of the community is fundamental to the traditional American concepts of democracy and academic freedom.

"The recent decision of the University of Washington to dismiss three faculty members on the basis of membership in the Communist Party, or on the premise of "guilt by association," is a shocking repudiation of this principle. If these dismissed professors are not reinstated, the result will be irreparable damage to all educational institutions and particularly to the University of Washington.

"The university's action, if it is not swiftly reversed, will set a precedent for the dismissal of any instructor for any personal beliefs and associations.

"As educators, deeply concerned for our own civil rights and those of our fellow citizens, and cognizant of the further implications of this action as a threat to our entire educational system, we urge the immediate reinstatement, with full rights of tenure, of the dismissed professors, Phillips, Butterworth, and Gundlach."

List of other professors whose names appear on the statement are attached.

## SIGNERS OF STATEMENT TO PRESIDENT ALLEN OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

(Universities and colleges listed for identification purposes only)

Dr. M. H. Abrams, Cornell University.	Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, Council on African Affairs.
Dr. Vaughn S. Albertson, Vanport College.	Dr. Barrows Dunham, Temple University.
Dr. Gordon Allport, Harvard University.	Dr. L. C. Dunn, Columbia University.
Dr. Kurt Anderson, Bennington College.	Dr. Henry Pratt Fairchild, New York University.
Prof. L. B. Arguimbau, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.	Dr. I. Fankuchen, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.
Dr. Albert F. Ax, Harvard University.	Dr. Harold Feldman, Cornell University.
Dr. Bernard Baum, University of Iowa.	Dr. Leon Festinger, University of Michigan.
Dr. Paul H. Baurman, University of Louisville.	Dr. Mary Jo Fink, University of Louisville.
Dr. Carter Bechtel, University of Louisville.	Dr. Joseph J. Firebaugh, University of Florida.
Dr. Albert J. Becker, Western Reserve University.	Dr. William H. Fisher, Eastern Washington College.
Dr. Robert O. Blood, Jr., William Penn College.	Prof. Joseph F. Fletcher, Episcopal Theological School.
Prof. Henry Blumberg, Ohio State University.	Dr. G. L. Foster, Columbia University.
Dr. Bart J. Bok, Harvard Observatory.	Dr. Frank S. Freeman, Cornell University.
Edith Keene Bower, American Association for Adult Education.	Dr. Stanley Friedman, Western Reserve University.
Dr. Theodore Brameld, New York University.	Dr. Wendell Furry, Harvard University.
Dr. Louise Fargo Brown, Vassar College.	Dr. Morris E. Garnsey, University of Colorado.
Dr. Robert Winzer Bruce, Lyndon Teachers College.	Dr. Christian Gauss, Princeton University.
Dr. Edith Burnett, Smith College.	Dr. Josephine M. Gleason, Vassar College.
Dr. Robert C. Challman, Menninger Foundation.	Dr. Alma Goetsch, Michigan State College.
Dr. Robert Chambers, New York University.	Dr. Irving Goodman, University of Colorado.
Dr. M. M. Chatterjee, Antioch College.	Dr. M. Goodman, Western Reserve University.
Dr. George B. Collins, University of Rochester.	Dr. David Haber, Yale.
Prof. Alfred Crofts, University of Denver.	Dr. William Haller, Jr., University of Massachusetts.
Prof. John J. DeBoer, University of Illinois.	Prof. Fowler Harper, Yale Law School.
Dr. Marion DeRonde, Smith College.	Dr. Frederick P. Harris, Western Reserve University.
Dr. Malcolm Dole, Northwestern University.	Dr. Mary Hemle, New School for Social Research.
Dr. Harl R. Douglass, University of Colorado.	

- Dr. Nicholas Hobbs, Columbia University.
- Dr. Lee Elbert Holt, American International College.
- Dr. Lloyd G. Humphreys, Stanford University.
- Dr. W. Hurewicz, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Dr. Robert Iglehart, New York University.
- Dr. Otto Jelinek, Grinnell College.
- Dr. Howard Mumford Jones, Harvard University.
- Dr. Mervin Jules, Smith College.
- Dr. Daniel Katz, University of Michigan.
- Dr. Noble H. Kelley, University of Louisville.
- Dr. John C. Kennedy, Oberlin College.
- Dr. George R. Kernodle, University of Iowa.
- Dr. Phillip Klein, New York School of Social Work.
- Dr. Ellis Kolebin, Columbia University.
- Dr. I. M. Kolthoff, University of Minnesota.
- Dr. Oliver W. Larkin, Smith College.
- Dr. Douglas H. Lawrence, Yale University.
- Dr. Ronald B. Levy, Roosevelt College.
- Dr. Gardner Lindzey, Harvard University.
- Dr. Bert James Loewenberg, Sarah Lawrence College.
- Dr. Helen Morrell Lynd, Sarah Lawrence College.
- Dr. Solomon Machover, Brooklyn College.
- Dr. Norman Maier, University of Michigan.
- Dr. F. L. Marcuso, Cornell University.
- Dr. S. E. Margolin, University of Louisville.
- Prof. J. M. Marsalka, Yale University.
- Dr. R. E. Marshak, University of Rochester.
- Dr. Glenn C. Martin, Santa Monica City College.
- Prof. Kirtley F. Mather, Harvard University.
- Dr. F. O. Matthliesson, Harvard University.
- Dr. Samuel J. McLaughlin, New York University.
- Dr. Alice McNiff, New York University.
- Dr. Willis B. Merriam, State College of Washington.
- Dr. Adolph E. Meyer, New York University.
- Prof. Otto Meyerhof, University of Pennsylvania.
- Dr. Ruby Turner Morris, Vassar College.
- Dr. Philip Morrison, Cornell University.
- Dr. George A. Muench, University of Louisville.
- Dr. Otto Nathan, New York University.
- Dr. Wesley Osterberg, Western Reserve University.
- Dr. Erwin Panofsky, Institute for Advanced Study.
- Dr. Melber Phillips, Brooklyn College.
- Dr. Dale Pontius, Roosevelt College.
- Dr. W. C. H. Prentice, Swarthmore College.
- Dr. Claire F. Rabo, Western Reserve University.
- Mr. Walter Rautonstrauch.
- Dr. Peter L. Rabe, Western Reserve University.
- Dr. T. W. Reese, Mount Holyoke College.
- Dean Geraldine Richard, Chandler School.
- Dr. Walter B. Rideout, Harvard University.
- Dr. Bernard F. Bless, Hunter College.
- Mr. Holland Robert, California Labor School.
- Dr. Milton Rokeach, Michigan State College.
- Prof. Clifford P. Rowe, Pacific University.
- Dr. Seymour B. Sarason, Yale University.
- Dr. S. Stansfeld Sargent, Columbia University.
- Dr. T. C. Schnelria, American Museum of Natural History.
- Dr. Waldo Schumacher, University of Oregon.
- Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, Williams College.
- Dr. William B. Sears, Cornell University.
- Dr. Theodore Shedlevsky, Rockefeller Institute.
- Mr. Henry W. Shelton, La Jolla, Calif.
- Dr. B. Othanel Smith, University of Illinois.
- Dr. M. Brewster Smith, Harvard University.
- Dr. Randolph B. Smith, New York City.
- Dr. P. A. Serekin, Harvard University.
- Dr. Rose Stagner, University of Illinois.
- Dr. R. J. Stauverman, Emery University.
- Dr. Bernhard J. Stern, Columbia University.
- Philippa F. Stowe, New York City.
- Dr. Dirk J. Struik, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Dr. Edward A. Suchman, Cornell University.
- Dr. Ralph B. Tower, West Virginia University.
- Dr. Charles Trinkhaus, Sarah Lawrence College.
- Dr. Ralph H. Turner, Oberlin College.
- Dr. Robert Ulich, Harvard University.
- Dr. J. Van der Zee, State University of Iowa.

Dr. T. W. Van Metre, Columbia University.  
 Dr. George B. Vetter, New York City.  
 Dr. John Volkmann, Mount Holyoke College.  
 Dr. Herbert Welsing, Institute for Advanced Study.  
 Dr. Louis Weisner, Hunter College.  
 Dr. Gene Weltfish, Columbia University.  
 Dr. Frank W. Weymouth, Stanford University.

Dr. Paul L. Whitely, Franklin and Marshall.  
 Dr. Maxine Wolfenstein, Western Reserve University.  
 Dr. Thomas Woody, University of Pennsylvania.  
 Prof. Colston E. Warne, Amherst College.  
 Dr. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale Law School.

(Partial list as of February 21, 1949.)

EXHIBIT 44

CULTURE AND THE CRISIS

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE WRITERS, ARTISTS, TEACHERS, PHYSICIANS, ENGINEERS, SCIENTISTS, AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL WORKERS OF AMERICA

League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford

In October this group was organized as the League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford. An editorial committee was appointed and instructed to expand the original statement into a 10,000-word open letter, and publish it as an election pamphlet. This pamphlet is now issued under the title of "Culture and the Crisis."

Leonie Adams	H. W. L. Dana	Matthew Josephson
Sherwood Anderson	Adolf Dehn	Alfred Kreyfberg
Newton Arvin	John Dos Passos	Louis Lozowick
Enjo Basshe	Howard N. Doughty, Jr.	Grace Lumpkin
Maurice Becker	Miriam Allen De Ford	Felix Morrow
Slater Brown	Waldo Frank	Samuel Ornitz
Fielding Burke	Alfred Frueh	James Rorty
Erskine Caldwell	Murray Godwin	Isidor Schneider
Robert Cantwell	Eugene Gordon	Frederick L. Schuman
Winifred L. Chappell	Horace Gregory	Edwin Seaver
Lester Cohen	Louis Gruhin	Herman Simpson
Louis Colman	John Herrmann	Lincoln Steffens
Lewis Corey	Granville Hicks	Charles Walker
Henry Cowell	Sidney Hook	Robert Whitaker
Malcolm Cowley	Sidney Howard	Edmund Wilson
Bruce Crawford	Langston Hughes	Ella Winter
Kyle S. Crichton	Orrick Johns	
Countee Cullen	William N. Jones	

Five cents per copy; \$1 for 25; \$3.50 for 100.

Send orders to League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York City.

EXHIBIT 45

LIST OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE LAST WEEK OF AUGUST 1944. AN INCOMPLETE LIST WAS PUBLISHED IN THE DAILY WORKER OF JULY 15, 1944

OFFICERS

Hon. George W. Norris, honorary chairman	Hon. Freda Kirchwey, vice chairman
Hon. Sidney Hillman, chairman	Hon. R. J. Thomas, treasurer
Hon. James G. Patton, vice chairman	Hon. James H. McGill, comptroller
	Hon. Clark Foreman, secretary

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Verda White Barnes	Freda Kirchwey	James G. Patton
Elmer A. Benson	James Loeb	G. Ford Pinchot
Van A. Bittner	Lacy Randolph Mason	R. J. Thomas
Clark Foreman	James H. McGill	Dr. Robert C. Weaver
Sidney Hillman	Philip Murray	A. F. Whitney

## MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Adamic, Louis, author, Milford, N. J.  
 Alexander, Dr. Will W., vice president, Julius Rosenwald Fund, North Carolina  
 Anderson, Mary, former Director, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.  
 Anderson, Mrs. Sherwood, New York City  
 Baldwin, C. B., assistant chairman, CIO Political Action Committee, New York  
 Balokovic, Zlatko, president, United Committee of South Slavic Americans, New York  
 Barnes, Verda White, director, women's division, CIO Political Action Committee, New York  
 Bauer, Catherine, author, California  
 Benet, William Rose, poet, New York  
 Benson, Elmer A., ex-Governor, Minnesota  
 Bethune, Mary McLeod (Mrs.), Daytona Beach, Fla.  
 Biggert, Robert (Mrs.), Winnetka, Ill.  
 Bittner, Van A., United Steelworkers of America, Washington, D. C.  
 Blaine, Emmons (Mrs.), Chicago, Ill.  
 Bliven, Bruce, editor, New Republic, New York  
 Boas, Dr. Ernst P., New York City  
 Bowie, Dr. W. Russell, professor, Union Theological Seminary, New York  
 Bremer, Otto, banker, St. Paul, Minn.  
 Bunzick, Zarko M., president, Serbian Vidovdas Congress, Akron, Ohio  
 Burke, J. Frank, Pasadena, Calif.  
 Butkovich, John D., president, Croatian Fraternal Union, Pennsylvania  
 Carey, James B., secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.  
 Clyde, Ethel (Mrs.), Huntington, Long Island  
 Connelly, Marc, Los Angeles, Calif.  
 Cooke, Morris Llewellyn, consulting engineer, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Coolidge, Albert Sprague, professor, Harvard University, Massachusetts  
 Corrothers, Rev. S. L., president, National Nonpartisan Colored Ministers Association, U. S. A., Westbury, Long Island  
 Curran, Joseph, president, National Maritime Union of America, New York  
 Dalrymple, Sherman H., president, United Rubber Workers of America, Ohio  
 Davis, Dr. Michael M., editor, Medical Care, New York  
 Dombrowski, Dr. James A., executive secretary, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Tennessee  
 Dunjee, Roscoe, editor and publisher, the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma  
 DuPont, Ethel, writer, Kentucky  
 DuPont, Zara, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Durr, Clifford (Mrs.), vice chairman, National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, Virginia  
 Eliot, Thomas H., attorney, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Embree, Edwin R., president, Julius Rosenwald Fund, Illinois  
 Epstein, Henry, attorney, New York City  
 Fitzgerald, Albert J., president, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, New York  
 Foreman, Clark, president, Southern Conference for Human Welfare  
 Frazier, Dr. E. Franklin, professor of sociology, Howard University, Washington, D. C.  
 Galbraith, John Kenneth, editorial department, Fortune Magazine  
 Gimbel, Elinor, Committee for the Care of Young Children in Wartime, New York City  
 Green, John, president, Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, New Jersey  
 Gutknecht, John, judge, municipal court, Chicago, Ill.  
 Harburg, E. Y., motion picture director, Hollywood, Calif.  
 Hastie, William, judge, dean, Howard Law School, Washington, D. C.  
 Hays, Mortimer, attorney, New York City.

Haywood, Allan S., administrator, Federal Workers of America, Washington, D. C.

Hecht, Ben, writer, California.

Hewes, L. I., Jr., Palo Alto, Calif., National Council on Race Relations.

Hillman, Sidney, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Hollander, Sidney, manufacturer, Maryland.

Hughes, Langston, poet, New York.

Imbrie, James, banker, Trenton, N. J.

Kenyon, Dorothy, judge, New York City.

Kingdon, Dr. Frank, author, New York.

Kirchwey, Freda, publisher, the Nation, New York.

Krzycki, Leo, president, American Slav Congress, New York.

Kulikowski, Adam, publisher, Opportunity, Virginia.

Lange, Oscar, professor, University of Chicago, Ill.

Lapp, John, independent labor conciliator, Chicago, Ill.

LeCron, James, assistant to Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Agriculture, Berkeley, Calif.

Lee, Canada, actor, New York City.

Lerner, Max, author, editor, PM, New York.

Lewis, Alfred Baker, Greenwich, Conn., president, Trade Union Accident and Health Association.

Lewis, John Frederick, president, Art Alliance, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lewis, William Draper, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lochard, Dr. Metz T., editor, Chicago Defender, Chicago, Ill.

Loeb, James, secretary, Union for Democratic Action, New York.

Layten, Dr. W. J., professor of astronomy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Mason, Lucy Randolph, Atlanta, Ga.

Maurer, Dr. Wesley, School of Journalism, University of Michigan.

McAllister, Mrs. Thomas F., former director, women's division, National Democratic Party, Grand Rapids, Mich.

McConnell, Francis J., bishop, New York City.

McCulloch, Frank, director, Mullenbach Institute, Chicago, Ill.

McDonald, David J., secretary-treasurer, United Steelworkers of America, Pennsylvania.

McGill, James H., McGill Manufacturing Co., Valparaiso, Ind.

McMahon, Francis, professor, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

McWilliams, Cary, attorney, writer, Los Angeles, Calif.

Motherwell, Hiram, author, New York.

Murray, Phillip, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.

Mulzac, Capt. Hugh, United States merchant marine, Jamaica, Long Island.

Nelson, William A., educator, Falls Village, Conn.

Niebuhr, Dr. Reinhold, professor, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Norris, Hon. George W., Nebraska.

Osowski, Dr. W. T., president, American Slav Congress, Michigan.

Patton, James G., president, National Farmers Union, Colorado.

Perry, Jennings, editor, Nashville Tennessean, Tennessee.

Pinchot, Cornelia Bryce, Washington, D. C.

Pinchot, Gifford, Milford, Pa.

Platek, V. X., president, National Slovak Society, Pennsylvania.

Pope, Dr. Liston, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

Popper, Martin, executive secretary, National Lawyers Guild.

Porter, Katherine Anne, writer, New York.

Poynter, Nelson, publisher, St. Petersburg Times, Florida.

Quilici, Judge George L., municipal court, Chicago, Ill.

Ratica, Peter, president, United Russian Orthodox Brotherhood of America, Pennsylvania.

Reid, Dr. Ira, associate director, Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Ga.

Reynolds, J. Louis, Reynolds Metals Co., Virginia.

Ricker, A. W., editor, Farm Union Herald, St. Paul, Minn.

Rieve, Emil, president, Textile Workers Union of America, New York.

Robeson, Paul, actor, New York.

Robinson, Edward G., Hollywood, Calif.

Robinson, Mrs. Edward G., Hollywood, Calif.

Robinson, Reid, president, United Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers of America, Colorado.

Rosenblum, Frank, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York.  
Rosenthal, Morris S., Stein, Hall & Co., Inc., New York.  
Ross, Mrs. J. D., Seattle, Wash.  
Ryan, H. Frank, managing editor, Courier-Post, Camden, N. J.  
Sackett, Sheldon F., editor, Coos Bay Times, Marshfield, Ore.  
Schlesinger, Arthur M., professor of history, Harvard University.  
Schuman, Frederick L., professor of international relations, Williams College, Massachusetts.  
Schwartz, C. K., attorney, Chicago, Ill.  
Seiferheld, David F., president, N. Erlanger Blumgart & Co., New York City.  
Smathers, Hon. William H., New Jersey.  
Smith, Lillian, editor, South Today, and author, "Strange Fruit", Georgia.  
Smith, S. Stephenson, Eugene, Ore.  
Soule, George, associate editor, New Republic, New York City.  
Speir, Mercedes Powell, president, Richmond Consumers Cooperative, Richmond, Va.  
Steele, Julian D., president, Boston Branch, NAACP, Boston, Mass.  
Swezey, Alan, professor of economics, Williams College, Massachusetts.  
Stone, Maurice L., business executive, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York.  
Thomas, R. J., president, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Detroit, Mich.  
Tilly, Mrs. M. E., jurisdictional secretary of Christian social relations of the southeastern jurisdiction of the Women's Society for Christian Service, Methodist Church, Georgia.  
Tobias, Dr. Channing H., member of Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation and Mayor's Committee on Unity, New York City.  
Townsend, Willard, president, United Transport Service Employees of America, Chicago, Ill.  
Van Kleeck, Mary, Russell-Sage Foundation, New York City.  
Walsh, J. Raymond, director of research, CIO Political Action Committee, New York.  
Waring, P. Alston, farmer-author, New Hope, Pa.  
Weaver, Dr. Robert C., Mayor's Committee on Racial Relations, Chicago, Ill.  
Welles, Orson, Hollywood, Calif.  
Wesley, Carter, publisher, Houston Informer, Tex.  
Wheelwright, Mrs. Ellen DuPont, Wilmington, Del.  
Whitney, A. F., president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Ohio.  
Williams, Aubrey, National Farmers Union, Washington, D. C.  
Wilson, Mrs. Luke I., Bethesda, Md.  
Wise, James Waterman, author, radio commentator, New York.  
Wright, Jr., Bishop R. R., executive secretary, Negro Fraternal Council of Churches in America, Ohio.  
Young, P. B., publisher, Norfolk Journal and Guide, Virginia.  
Zeman, Jr., Stephen, president, Slovak Evangelical Union, Pennsylvania.  
Zurhal, Prof. Jaroslav J., president, Czechoslovak National Council, Illinois.

## EXHIBIT 46

[From Daily Worker, New York, Wednesday, April 16, 1947]

## NOTABLES DEFEND COMMUNIST RIGHTS

More than 100 prominent individuals yesterday called upon Congress to defeat the various "exceptional and punitive measures directed against the Communist Party," now in the hands of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Signers of the letter include Thomas Mann, Franklin P. Adams, Vincent Sheean, Prof. Frederick L. Schuman of Williams College, Mr. and Mrs. Sherwood Eddy, Mrs. Margaret Sanger Slee, Jo Davidson, Garson Kanin, Libby Holman, and Dean Walter G. Mudder of Boston University School of Theology.

"Legislation such as that proposed by Congressmen Rankin, Sheppard, Hartley, Parnell Thomas, and McDonough follows the Hitler pattern," the signers declared in a letter to House Speaker Joseph Martin, released by the Civil Rights Congress.

"The Communist Party is a legal American political party. We see nothing in its program, record or activities, either in war or peace to justify the enactment of the repressive legislation now being urged upon the Congress in an atmosphere of an organized hysteria."



Among the other signers of the letter are Samuel L. M. Barlow, Sholem Asch, Elmer A. Benson, former Governor of Minnesota; Prof. S. P. Breckenridge, University of Chicago; Zlatko Balokovic, Professors Archibald Cox, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana and F. O. Matthiessen of Harvard University; Prof. J. Frank Dobie, University of Texas, Adolf Dehn.

Also, Mayor Cornelius D. Scully, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Charles Houston, attorney Roscoe Dunjee, Oklahoma City; Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild, Howard East, Dr. Harry F. Ward, John Howard Lawson, Agnes Smedley, Rev. Charles F. McClennan, Cleveland, Ohio; Arthur Miller, Artur Schnabel, Dashiell Hammett, and Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown, president, Palmer Memorial Institute.

Also, Max Weber, William Jay Schieffelin, Dr. E. Franklin Frazier, Howard University; Bishop W. Y. Bell, Cordele, Ga.; Matthew Josephson, historian; Rabbi Jacob H. Kaplan, Miami, Fla.; Francis Fisher Kane, Philadelphia attorney; Prof. Malcolm Sharp, University of Chicago Law School; George Marshall and Milton Kaufman, Civil Rights Congress.

(Titles and institutions for identification only.)

EXHIBIT 47

NATIONAL WALLACE FOR PRESIDENT COMMITTEE,  
39 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

*For A. M. Release, Friday, March 26, 1948*

Formation of a 700-member National Wallace for President Committee was announced yesterday (Thursday) by Elmer A. Benson, former Minnesota Governor and chairman of the Wallace group.

The committee will hold its first meeting in Chicago April 9, 10, and 11, to make plans for the formation of a new national political party and to plan the program for the Wallace campaign.

Programs for the various divisions of the Wallace committee will be drafted on the opening day of the meeting. The divisions include those for labor, women, professional groups, nationality groups, youth, and farm.

On April 10 and through part of April 11, State directors from approximately 40 States will report on their organizational progress and their drive to put Wallace's name on the ballot. The press will be admitted to this session of the meeting.

On the night of April 10 the committee members will attend a mass rally at the Chicago Stadium, where both Mr. Wallace and Senator Glen Taylor will speak.

The Chicago meeting will also issue the call for the new party convention and set the date and place.

Eleven new State parties have already been formed by Wallace groups. Plans are already under way for forming new parties shortly in 24 other States.

Among the 700 members of the committee are:

Zlatko Balokovic, violinist and president of the American Slav Congress, New York; Charlotta Bass, California publisher; Leonard Bernstein, musician, New York; Bart J. Bok, assistant director of Harvard University Observatory, Massachusetts; Harry Bridges, president, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, California; Charlotte Hawkins Brown, educator, North Carolina; Scott Buchanan, educator, Massachusetts; Quentin Burdick, education director of North Dakota Farmers Union; Dr. Allan N. Butler, Harvard Medical School, Massachusetts; Hugh Bryson, president, Marine Cooks and Stewards Union, CIO; Mrs. Evans Carlson, Oregon; John Clark, president, Mine, Mill, and Smelters Union, CIO, Illinois; Robert Coates, New Yorker Magazine; John Coe, State senator, Florida; Fannie Cook, novelist, Missouri; Dr. Leo Davidoff, neurosurgeon, Montefiore Hospital, New York; Prof. Frank Dobie, University of Texas; Olin Downes, music critic, New York; W. E. B. DuBois, research director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York; Roscoe Dunjee, publisher, Oklahoma; James Durkin, president, United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO, New York; Mrs. Clifford Durr, Virginia; Prof. Thomas Emerson, Yale Law School; Jose Ferrer, actor, New York; Prof. Robin Field, Tulane University, Louisiana; Albert J. Fitzgerald, president, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, New York; Dr. Clark Foreman, president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Georgia; Mrs. Elinor Gimbel, New York; Josiah Gitt, publisher, York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily; Ben Gold, president, Fur Workers International Union, CIO, New York; Uta Hagen, actress, New York; Roy Harris, composer,

Colorado; Lillian Hellman, playwright, New York; Donald Henderson, president, Food, Tobacco, and Agricultural Workers of America, CIO; Ira A. Hirschmann, former inspector general for UNRRA, New York; Henry T. Hunt, former mayor of Cincinnati; N. Floyd Hunter, director, Community Planning Council, Atlanta, Ga.; John Huston, film director, California; Congressman Leo Isacson, New York; Francis Fisher Kane, Philadelphia; Howard Koch, Hollywood screen writer; Leo Krzycki, retired vice president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Wisconsin; Canada Lee, actor, New York; Curtis McDougall, Northwestern University, Illinois; James McGill, Indiana manufacturer; Howard McKenzie, vice president, National Maritime Union, CIO; Aline McMahon, actress, Los Angeles; Congressman Vito Marcantonio, New York; Prof. F. O. Matthiessen, Harvard University, Massachusetts; Daniel Mebane, publisher, New Republic, New York; Frederic G. Melcher, editor of Publishers' Weekly, New Jersey; Dmitri Mitropolous, conductor of the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra; Capt. Hugh Mulzac, captain of the *Booker T. Washington*; Stanley Nowak, State senator, Michigan; Grant W. Oakes, president, Farm Equipment Workers Union, CIO, Illinois; Sono Osato, actress, California; Dr. Linus Pauling, physicist, California Institute of Technology; Morris Pizer, president, United Furniture Workers of America, CIO; Abraham Pomerantz, former United States prosecutor at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials, New York; Lee Pressman, former CIO general counsel; Michael J. Quill, president, Transport Workers of America, CIO; Magistrate Joseph Rainey, Philadelphia; O. John Rogge, former Assistant United States Attorney General, New York; Prof. John G. Rideout, Durham, N. H.; Prof. Frederick L. Schumann, Williams College, Massachusetts; Joseph P. Selly, president, American Communications Association, CIO; Artie Shaw, bandleader, Norwalk, Conn.; Dr. Michael A. Shadid, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Dr. Maud Slye, director of the University of Chicago Cancer Research; Mrs. Edgar Snow (Nym Wales) Madison, Conn.; Robert St. John, author, New York; Kenneth Spencer, singer, New York; Fred Stover, president, Iowa Farmers Union; Mark Van Doren, poet, New York; Mary Van Kleeck, Russell Sage Foundation, New York; F. A. Vider, chairman, Slovene American National Council, Chicago; Smeale Voydanoff, president, Macedonian American Peoples League, Michigan; Addie L. Weber, president, New Jersey State Federation of Teachers, AFL; Don West, poet, Oglethorpe University, Atlanta, Ga.; Nelson Willis, president, Cook County Bar Association, Chicago; James Waterman Wise, New York; Ed Yeomans, director of the Eastern Division, National Farmers Union; Chester Young, vice president, National Maritime Union, CIO.

Assistant M. Benson as cochairman of the committee are Jo Davidson, sculptor; Albert J. Fitzgerald, president of the CIO United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America; Mrs. Anita McCormick Blaine, of Chicago; Paul Robeson, singer, and Dr. Rexford G. Tugwell of the University of Illinois faculty.

Committee treasurer is Angus Cameron, editor in chief of Little, Brown & Co., publishers. Campaign manager is C. B. Baldwin.

## EXHIBIT 48

THE TEXT OF AN OPEN CALLING FOR GREATER UNITY OF THE ANTI-FASCIST FORCES AND STRENGTHENING OF THE FRONT AGAINST AGGRESSION THROUGH CLOSER COOPERATION WITH THE SOVIET UNION RELEASED ON AUGUST 14 BY 400 LEADING AMERICANS

*To All Active Supporters of Democracy and Peace*

One of the greatest problems confronting all those engaged in the struggle for democracy and peace, whether they be liberals, progressives, trade-unionists, or others, is how to unite their various forces so as to achieve victory for their common goals. The Fascists and their allies are well aware that democracy will win if its supporters are united. Accordingly, they are intent on destroying such unity at all costs.

On the international scene the Fascists and their friends have tried to prevent a united antiaggression front by sowing suspicion between the Soviet Union and other nations interested in maintaining peace.

On the domestic scene the reactionaries are attempting to split the democratic front by similar tactics. Realizing that here in America they cannot get far with a definitely pro-Fascist appeal, they strive to pervert American anti-Fascist sentiment to their own ends. With the aim of turning anti-Fascist feeling against the Soviet Union they have encouraged the fantastic falsehood that the U. S. S. R. and the totalitarian states are basically alike. By this strategy they hope to

create dissension among the progressive forces whose united strength is a first necessity for the defeat of fascism.

Some sincere American liberals have fallen into this trap and unwittingly aided a cause to which they are essentially opposed. Thus, a number of them have carelessly lent their signatures to the recent manifesto issued by the so-called Committee for Cultural Freedom. This manifesto denounces in vague, undefined terms all forms of "Dictatorship" and asserts that the Fascist states and Soviet Russia equally menace American institutions and the democratic way of life.

While we prefer to dwell on facts rather than personalities, we feel it is necessary to point out that among the signers of this manifesto are individuals who have for years had as their chief political objective the maligning of the Soviet people and their government, and it is precisely these people who are the initiators and controllers of the committee.

A number of other committees have been formed which give lip service to democracy and peace while actually attacking the Soviet Union and aiding reaction. Honest persons approached by such committees should scrutinize their aims very carefully and support only those groups genuinely interested in preserving culture and freedom and refusing to serve as instruments for attacking the Soviet Union or aiding fascism in any other way.

The undersigned do not represent any committee or organization, nor do they propose to form one. Our object is to point out the real purpose behind all these attempts to bracket the Soviet Union with the Fascist states, and to make it clear that Soviet and Fascist policies are diametrically opposed. To this end we should like to stress ten basic points in which Soviet socialism differs fundamentally from totalitarian fascism.

1. The Soviet Union continues as always to be a consistent bulwark against war and aggression, and works unceasingly for the goal of a peaceful international order.

2. It has eliminated racial and national prejudice within its borders, freed the minority peoples enslaved under the Tzars, stimulated the development of the culture and economic welfare of these peoples, and made the expression of anti-semitism or any racial animosity a criminal offense.

3. It has socialized the means of production and distribution through the public ownership of industry and the collectivization of agriculture.

4. It has established nation-wide socialist planning, resulting in increasingly higher living standards and the abolition of unemployment and depression.

5. It has built the trade unions, in which almost 24,000,000 workers are organized, into the very fabric of its society.

6. The Soviet Union has emancipated woman and the family, and has developed an advanced system of child care.

7. From the viewpoint of cultural freedom, the difference between the Soviet Union and the Fascist countries is most striking. The Soviet Union has effected one of the most far-reaching cultural and educational advances in all history and among a population which at the start was almost three-fourths illiterate. Those writers and thinkers whose books have been burned by the Nazis are published in the Soviet Union. The best literature from Homer to Thomas Mann, the best thought from Aristotle to Lenin, is available to the masses of the Soviet people, who themselves actively participate in the creation of culture.

8. It has replaced the myths and superstitions of old Russia with the truths and techniques of experimental science, extending scientific procedures to every field, from economics to public health. And it has made science and scientific study available to the mass of the people.

9. The Soviet Union considers political dictatorship a transitional form and has shown a steadily expanding democracy in every sphere. Its epoch-making new constitution guarantees Soviet citizens universal suffrage, civil liberties, the right to employment, to leisure, to free education, to free medical care, to material security in sickness and old age, to equality of the sexes in all fields of activity, and to equality of all races and nationalities.

10. In relation to Russia's past, the country has been advancing rapidly along the road of material and cultural progress in ways that the American people can understand and appreciate.

The Soviet Union has an economic system different from our own. But Soviet aims and achievements make it clear that there exists a sound and permanent basis in mutual ideals for cooperation between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. on behalf of world peace and the security and freedom of all nations.

Accordingly, the signers of this letter urge Americans of whatever political persuasion to stand firmly for close cooperation in this sphere between the United States and Soviet Russia, and to be on guard against any and all attempts to prevent such cooperation in this critical period in the affairs of mankind.

Among the 400 signers of the open letter are:

Dr. Thomas Addes, professor of medicine, Leland Stanford University  
 Helen Alfred, executive director National Public Housing Conference  
 Prof. Newton Arvin, professor of English, Smith College  
 Dr. Charles S. Bacon, honorary president, American Russian Institute, Chicago, Ill.  
 Frank C. Bancroft, editor, Social Work Today  
 Maurice Becker, artist  
 Louis P. Birk, editor, Modern Age Books, Inc.  
 T. A. Bisson, research associate, Foreign Policy Association  
 Alice Stone Blackwell, suffragist, writer  
 Marc B. Itzstein, composer  
 Anita Block, Theater Guild playreader  
 Stirling Bowen, poet  
 Richard Boyer, staff writer, The New Yorker  
 Millen Brand, writer  
 Simon Breines, architect  
 Robert Briffault, writer  
 Prof. Dorothy Brewster, assistant professor of English, Columbia University  
 Prof. Edwin Berry Burgum, associate professor of English, New York University  
 Fielding Burke, writer  
 Katherine Devereaux Blake, teacher  
 Meta Berger, writer, widow of the first Socialist Congressman  
 Prof. Robert A. Brady, professor of economics, University of California  
 J. E. Bromberg, actor  
 Bessie Beatty, writer  
 Vera Caspary, scenario writer  
 Maria Cristina Chambers, of the Authors' League  
 Prof. Robert Chambers, research professor of biology, New York University  
 Harold Churman, producer  
 Robert M. Coates, writer  
 Lester Cohen, writer  
 Kyle Crichton, editorial staff of Collier's Weekly  
 Miriam Allen De Ford, writer  
 Paul de Kruif, writer  
 Pietro di Donato, writer  
 William Dodd, Jr., chairman Anti-Nazi Literature Committee  
 Stanley D. Dodge, University of Michigan  
 Prof. Dorothy Douglas, department of economics, Smith College  
 Muriel Draper, writer  
 Prof. L. C. Dunn, professor of zoology, Columbia University  
 Prof. Haakon Chevalier, professor of French, University of California  
 Prof. George B. Cressey, chairman of the department of geology and geography, Syracuse University  
 Harriet G. Eddy, library specialist  
 Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild, professor of sociology, New York University  
 Kenneth Fearing, poet  
 Prof. Mildred Fairchild, professor of economics, Bryn Mawr College  
 Alice Withrow Field, writer  
 Sara Bard Field, writer  
 William O. Field, Jr., chairman of the board, American Russian Institute  
 Irving Fineman, writer  
 Marjorie Fischer, writer  
 Angel Flores, writer, critic  
 Waldo Frank, writer  
 Wanda Gao, artist  
 Hugo Gellert, artist  
 Robert Gessner, department of English, New York University  
 Prof. Willystine Goodsell, associate professor of education (retired), Columbia University  
 Mortimer Graves, of the American Council of Learned Societies  
 Dr. John H. Gray, economist, former president of the American Economics Association  
 William Gropper, artist  
 Maurice Halperin, associate editor, Books Abroad  
 Earl P. Hanson, explorer, writer  
 Prof. Samuel N. Harper, professor of Russian language and institutions, Chicago University.  
 Rev. Thomas L. Harris, national executive secretary, American League for Peace and Democracy  
 Dashiell Hammett, writer  
 Ernest Hemingway  
 Granville Hicks, writer  
 Prof. Norman E. Himes, department of sociology, Colgate University  
 Charles J. Hendley, President Teachers' Union of the City of New York  
 Leo Huberman, writer  
 Langston Hughes, poet  
 Agatha Illes, writer  
 Rev. Otis G. Jackson, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Flint, Mich.  
 Sam Jaffe, actor  
 Orrick Johns, poet  
 Matthew Josephson, writer

George Kauffman, playwright  
 Prof. Alexander Kaun, associate professor of Slavic languages, University of California  
 Fred C. Kelly, writer  
 Rockwell Kent, artist  
 Dr. John A. Kingsbury, social worker, administrative consultant, WPA  
 Beatrice Kinhead, writer  
 Lincoln E. Kirstein, ballet producer  
 Arthur Kober, playwright  
 Alfred Kreymborg, poet  
 Edward Lamb, lawyer  
 Dr. Corliss Lamont, writer, lecturer  
 Margaret I. Lamont, sociologist, writer  
 J. J. Lankes, artist  
 Jay Leyda, cinema critic  
 John Howard Lawson, playwright  
 Emil Lengyel, writer, critic  
 Prof. Max Lerner, professor of government, Williams College  
 Meridel LeSueur, writer  
 Meyer Levin, writer  
 Prof. Charles W. Lightbody, department of government and history, St. Lawrence University  
 Robert Morss Lovett, Governor of the Virgin Islands, and editor of The New Republic  
 Prof. Halford E. Luccock, Yale University Divinity School  
 Katherine DuPre Lumpkin, writer  
 Klaus Mann, lecturer, writer, son of Thomas Mann  
 Prof. F. O. Matthiessen, associate professor of history of literature, Harvard University  
 Dr. Anita Marburg, department of English, Sarah Lawrence College  
 Dr. George Marshall, economist  
 Aline MacMahon, actress  
 Clifford T. McAvoy, instructor, department of romance languages, College of the City of New York  
 Prof. V. J. McGill, professor of philosophy, Hunter College  
 Prof. Robert McGregor, Reed College  
 Ruth McKenney, writer  
 Darwin J. Mesrobian, lawyer  
 Prof. Herbert A. Miller, professor of economics, Bryn Mawr College  
 Harvey O'Connor, writer  
 Clifford Odets, playwright  
 Shaemus O'Sheel, writer, critic  
 Mary White Ovington, social worker  
 S. J. Perelman, writer  
 Dr. John P. Peters, department of internal medicine, Yale University Medical School  
 Dr. Emily M. Pierson, physician  
 Walter N. Polakov, engineer  
 Prof. Alan Porter, professor of German, Vassar College  
 George D. Pratt, Jr., agriculturist  
 John Hyde Preston, writer  
 Samuel Putnam, writer  
 Prof. Paul Radin, professor of anthropology, University of California  
 Prof. Walter Rautenstrach, professor of industrial engineering, Columbus University  
 Bernard J. Reis, accountant  
 Bertha C. Reynolds, social worker  
 Lynn Riggs, playwright  
 Col. Raymond Robins, former head of American Red Cross in Russia  
 William Rollins, Jr., writer  
 Harold J. Rome, composer  
 Ralph Roeder, writer  
 Dr. Joseph A. Rosen, former head, Jewish Joint Distribution Board  
 Eugene Schoen, architect  
 Prof. Margaret Shlaich, associate professor of English, New York University  
 Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, professor of government, Williams College  
 Prof. Vida D. Scudder, professor emerita of English, Wellesley College  
 George Seldes, writer  
 Vincent Sheean, writer  
 Viola Brothers Shore, scenario writer  
 Herman Shumlin, producer  
 Prof. Ernest J. Simmons, assistant professor of English literature, Harvard University  
 Irina Skariatina, writer  
 Dr. F. Tredwell Smith, educator  
 Dr. Stephenson Smith, president, Oregon Commonwealth Federation  
 Hester Sondergaard, actress  
 Isobel Walker Soule, writer, editor  
 Lionel Stander, actor  
 Christina Stead, writer  
 A. F. Steig, artist  
 Alfred K. Stern, housing specialist

Senator McCARTHY. I would like to call one to the committee's attention, something I did not suspect before I saw this document.

It seems that on September 12, 1949, one of these Communist-front organizations sponsored a dinner for Henry A. Wallace and, believe it or not, the covert charge was \$10.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand that you have hired a staff to obtain the complete information on anyone in the State Department or closely related agencies who is suspected of being a bad security risk.

I am, therefore, submitting to the chairman for the attention of the staff a list of 25 names which requires further investigation. All of these individuals to the best of my knowledge are either in the State Department, or in closely related agencies. At least they were very recently.

Senator TYDINGS. We will look them up.

Senator McCARTHY. I understand all of them have been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and that such FBI investigations have developed information which is now in the files—information which, according to Acheson's own "yardstick of loyalty" would stamp many, if not all of them, as being bad security risks.

With the very limited staff which I have available (and, as the Chair knows, I have been allocated no funds for this investigation; I have been conducting it completely on my own), it would take me a considerable period of time to develop all of the information on all of these individuals and submit individual cases on each of them to the committee.

I intend, of course, to continue my investigation and assemble all available information which comes to my attention on any of these individuals, which information shall be available to the staff of this committee.

In the meantime, in order to get things started, I believe the staff might well start checking on these individuals. Obviously, the staff could do a much speedier job in that the files, which are not easily available to me, will be available to the committee.

None of the names which I now hand the Chair covers the cases which I covered on the Senate floor.

Let me make that clear. These are additional names, some I had not had time to develop when I made the speech on the Senate floor.

Senator TYDINGS. We are glad to have them. We will look into them, examine the files, and make a report.

Senator McCARTHY. I thank the chairman.

I shall continue to develop as much information on those cases as possible and will, of course, submit to the committee all such information as soon as I have it properly documented.

I have remaining a considerable amount of information on the balance of these cases covered on the Senate floor, which information is being assembled as rapidly as possible and put into shape to be presented to the committee. This task will be completed as soon as possible.

I now give the Chair, if I may, these names.

Senator TYDINGS. These are the keys?

Senator McCARTHY. Those are the 25 names that have bad information in their files, information which indicates they should not be there.

Senator TYDINGS. I am very hopeful that we can get our staff under way some time during the week, and I would like to consult the Senator as to his convenience when he will give us in executive session, as he said he would, the names of the 81 people, some of whom he has since given us in public, but all of the 81 cases that he delineated on the Senate floor, so that we may key the names to the information which the Senator has given us, and when we request the files, make sure that we are requesting them for all the people that he has mentioned in his testimony.

I would like to say to the Senator that it would be very helpful to the committee if we could get all of the names at one time, for this reason: I would like to make the request in writing, confidentially of course, to the proper authorities for all of these files at one time, and provide a safe place, arranged as they come from different departments, where they can all be assembled in one room, so that if the Civil Service files or State Department or any other files are needed, we will have them all in one place, where we can make a thorough and complete investigation of a case without having to go from one department to another, and I am sure the Senator will want it done that way.

Senator McCARTHY. I think it is an excellent idea.

Senator TYDINGS. But unless we have all of the files in one room at the start, it will take us much longer than we need to do it. So I will ask the Senator, as I said, at his convenience, in executive session, today if he would like to, or tomorrow, if he will not give us the keys so that we can turn them over to counsel and our staff and begin the operation of assembling these files.

Senator McCARTHY. Let me say to the Chair that as soon as I have all the information assembled which I have—I think I have considerable information of benefit to your staff.

Senator TYDINGS. We would like to have it.

Senator McCARTHY. It will all be turned over with the names. I have given you the names of 25 that I consider very important, 25 that I have not been able to develop beyond the point of knowing that the files are valuable. The files show that the FBI has given information which, so far as I know, makes them bad security risks under Acheson's own yardstick. The staff will have plenty to do on those 25 and will have no difficulty at all, I am sure, in transmitting to the staff information which I have. I am sure we will get along on that very well.

I might say that before I turn over the Senate floor cases I want to check all of the information, document it, and give it to you. There seems to be a great deal of interest, and rightly so, on the part of people as to just the extent of the information we have on those particular cases.

Senator TYDINGS. I would say to the Senator that during the course of this proceeding if he will come to me with any additional matter that he has not given to us at the start, we will be glad to have it.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding about it, I would appreciate it if the Senator would hand it personally to me until such time as I can designate somebody else to hand it to in the event that I am not available at the moment.

As I understand it, the Senator has now placed his case before us, and he wants us to go ahead and investigate these loyalty files and so on.

Senator McCARTHY. You understand that I have a sizable number of additional cases to lay before the Senator, work that will take, I assume, 2 or 3 or 4 days. Whether the Chair will want it in executive session or in public I frankly do not care.

Senator TYDINGS. How does the Senator want to do it?

Senator McCARTHY. I think, Mr. Chairman, when we refer to men like John Service, Owen Lattimore, individuals of top importance, I believe any facts which we have with regard to them definitely

should be made public. I think those morals cases, which also are extremely bad security risks, obviously should be made in executive session. Then there is an area in between which I frankly don't care whether they are made in public or executive session.

I might say this, outside of the top men, like Hanson, who is taking over this point 4 program, Lattimore, and several other names that I think should be given in public, I think the names better be given in executive session, now that you have a staff to check on them. That is merely my suggestion.

I might say to the Chair I would like to see the Chair follow through his suggestion this afternoon. I can give him information which I think—

Senator TYDINGS. I am going to ask the Senator if he won't hold that information until tomorrow, because I have no place to keep it. I prefer to have the Senator keep it until tomorrow, until I can make some definite arrangements for quarters and one or two other things, protecting the information we get and so on.

What I would like to know is, does the Senator want us to go ahead now, or does he want us to sit to hear more things?

Senator McCARTHY. I will have considerable more, Mr. Chairman, but I would like some time to develop the cases so I can present them in chronological order, with all the information I have. That will take me time.

Senator TYDINGS. I am not questioning it. I am just trying to find out to accommodate the Senator. When does he think he will want to have this stuff available, and how does he want to deliver it to us? Does he want to do it in a session such as we are in now, or does he want to hand it to the committee for investigation? There are five of us on the committee. Whatever way the Senator wants to do it, we will try to accommodate him. We will leave that up to his judgment.

Senator McCARTHY. I thank the Chair, and as I get the other cases in shape I will contact the Chair, and I am sure we can work out something completely satisfactory to both the committee and myself as to how the further facts will be presented.

Senator TYDINGS. In order to make the record straight, I put in the record the first day, cut out, the case numbers from 1 to 81, I think it was, and put those in the record so that we would have that already as a part of the testimony, and I take it for granted the Senator wants that made a part of his sworn testimony.

Senator McCARTHY. I do not mind having it made part of the record. If the chairman wants me to repeat any of it under oath, I will be glad to do so.

Senator TYDINGS. I do not want you to repeat it. I want to know what category it is in. I want to know whether you desire it to be part of your sworn testimony. We can put it in as a part of the Congressional Record, or we can put it in as part of his sworn testimony. Which would he prefer?

Senator McCARTHY. I do not follow the chairman. The chairman has put the evidence in the record. That is the committee's testimony. If I see fit to put any testimony in, I will put it in. Do you follow me?



Senator TYDINGS. What I meant was, the Senator gave us 81 cases on the floor of the Senate. I am not trying to take any advantage of the Senator.

Senator McCARTHY. The Senator would have difficulty doing that.

Senator TYDINGS. I believe I would, and I would not do it if I could. I would like the Senator to believe that. I want him to have a fair chance here in every sense of the word.

Senator McCARTHY. I am sure the Chair does.

Senator TYDINGS. He delineated 81 cases on the floor of the Senate, which I have put in the record. I see no reason why they should not be a part of the Senator's sworn testimony, that he is bringing those cases before the committee.

Senator McCARTHY. The only way you can make those part of the sworn testimony, Mr. Chairman, is to ask me to repeat them. You cannot make an oath retroactive. I do not follow the Chair at all, and I assume the Chair is not a lawyer. There is no way of making an oath retroactive. If the Chair wants me to repeat what I said on the Senate floor, under oath, I will be glad to come in and do that. There is no possible way the Chair can put things in the record and say "Now will you consider that as part of your testimony under oath?"

Let's make this clear. If the Chair wants me to come back here at any time and repeat any part or all of what I said on the Senate floor, and do it under oath, I will be glad to do it. I am not going to try to indulge in some completely impossible and ridiculous procedure of trying to make an oath retroactive.

Senator TYDINGS. I have no disposition to make it retroactive. What I thought was, the Senator has testified under oath. He has also delineated certain cases on the Senate floor. I simply wanted to ask him if the remarks he made on the Senate floor, and which are now a part of the record, he wishes included in his sworn testimony, or whether he wishes them not included in the sworn testimony. That is all I asked the Senator.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, regardless of what my wishes are, the only way I can make them part of the sworn testimony is to swear to them, either in affidavit form or repeat them. If the Chair desires them put in affidavit form, if he wants me to repeat them, I will be glad to take that up with him. Otherwise, the Chair has introduced them.

Senator TYDINGS. All right, if the Senator does not want to make them part of his sworn testimony.

Senator McCARTHY. I will make it part of my sworn testimony if the Chair wants me to come in and repeat it. There is no way of making an oath retroactive.

Senator TYDINGS. Certainly there is. All he needs to say is "All the things I gave in these cases on the Senate floor I would like considered a part of my sworn testimony." It is just as simple as that. There is no trick about that.

Senator McCARTHY. I am telling the Chair it can't be done, but if he wants me to come in and read that part of the Congressional Record under oath, I will be glad to do that at any time, this afternoon.

Senator TYDINGS. I was asked by some committee members to ask that question of the Senator, and I have discharged my obligation to them.

Whenever the Senator wants to return to the stand, all he has to do is to tell the chairman.

Senator McCARTHY. I thank the chairman very much.

Senator TYDINGS. I would like to ask if Judge Dorothy Kenyon is in the room? I don't know her. She may have some friends in the room. We are counting on hearing her at 2:30 this afternoon unless when I get to my office I find she has requested a postponement to another day. So far I have received no such message, so unless that is received, we will proceed, as scheduled yesterday, at 2:30, to hear Judge Kenyon.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p. m., a recess was taken until 2:30 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator TYDINGS. The committee will come to order.

For the record, the day that Senator McCarthy testified, bringing in the name of Miss, or Judge Dorothy Kenyon, I received a telegram, either that day or the following morning, I think that night, in which Miss Kenyon asked me to accord her the privilege of a hearing.

I immediately replied and told her that I would be glad to set Tuesday, today, as the time when she might come before this committee and answer any remarks or charges which Senator McCarthy had made, and asked her was that satisfactory.

I immediately received another telegram from Judge Kenyon in which she said Tuesday would be satisfactory, and she is here in response to those telegrams.

So that Judge Kenyon may know what the powers of this committee are, and what its duty is, and I think we owe it to her, she may not have seen the formal resolution which brought us into being, I would like to read it before she testifies.

This is Senate Resolution 231. It was agreed to on February 22, 1950. The resolution reads as follows:

That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are or have been employed by the Department of State. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable, and if said recommendations are to include formal charges of disloyalty against any individual, then the committee, before making said recommendations, shall give said individual open hearings for the purpose of taking evidence or testimony on said charges. In the conduct of this study and investigation, the committee is directed to procure, by subpoena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard.

Senator McCarthy, on the first day he appeared before our committee in open hearing, made certain statements, Judge Kenyon, in which your name was drawn.

You are now at liberty to proceed to answer them in such manner as you deem fit.

Before you testify, will you stand and raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly promise that the testimony you shall give in this matter pending before the committee, in accordance with Senate Resolution 231, shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss KENYON. I do.

Senator TYDINGS. Take a seat, Judge. You may proceed.

**TESTIMONY OF MISS DOROTHY KENYON, ACCOMPANIED BY  
THEODORE KIENDL, COUNSEL**

Miss KENYON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to appear.

My name is Dorothy Kenyon. I live at No. 433 West Twenty-first Street, New York City. I am a practicing lawyer with offices located at No. 50 Broadway, New York City.

When I was informed of the accusations that were made against me before this subcommittee last week, I did explode. Doubtless my indignation led me to make some impulsive remarks in unparliamentary language. Reflection, and a recollection refreshed by such investigation as I could make in the interim, now permits a more dispassionate approach. However, nothing can diminish the deep resentment I feel that such outrageous charges should be publicized before this subcommittee and broadcast over the entire Nation without any notice or warning to me.

My answer to these charges is short, simple, and direct. I am not, and never have been disloyal. I am not and never have been, a Communist. I am not, and never have been a fellow traveler. I am not, and never have been, a supporter of, a member of, or a sympathizer with any organization known to me to be, or suspected by me of being, controlled or dominated by Communists. As emphatically and unreservedly as possible, I deny any connection of any kind or character with communism or its adherents. If this leaves anything unsaid to indicate my total and complete detestation of that political philosophy, it is only because it is impossible for me to express my sentiments. I mean my denial to be all-inclusive.

So absolute a negation of the charges should be supplemented with an equally positive, but brief, affirmation of what I am and have been.

I received my A. B. degree from Smith College and my law degree—doctor juris—from New York University Law School. I am a member of Phi Beta Kappa and have been for several years a senator of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

I come of a family of lawyers, my father having been a patent lawyer in New York City where my brothers and a cousin now practice under the firm name of Kenyon & Kenyon. My father's cousin, William S. Kenyon, was for many years a member of the United States Senate and later a Federal judge in Iowa.

I was admitted to the bar in 1917 and have practiced law continually ever since, except during certain periods when I held public office. Mine is a general practice. I am a member of the Bar Association of the City of New York, the New York County Lawyers' Association, the New York State Bar Association, the American Bar Association, the National Women Lawyers' Association, the American Society of International Law, the American Branch of the International Law Association and several others.

I have held public office three times, first from June 1, 1936, to December 31, 1937, 2 years, as deputy commissioner of licenses by appointment of Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia; second from January 1,

1939, to December 31, 1939, 1 year, as municipal court judge in New York City, also by appointment of Mayor LaGuardia; and third, from January 1, 1947, to December 31, 1949, as United States delegate to the Commission on the Status of Women of the United Nations, by appointment of President Truman, ratified and confirmed by the Senate. I was also appointed in January 1938 by the League of Nations as one of a Commission of seven jurists—of whom I was the only American—to study the legal status of women throughout the world. This Commission continued to operate until the war made further communication between its members impossible. I have also served on a number of governmentally appointed commissions and committees dealing with such varied subjects as the regulation of employment agencies, minimum-wage legislation, consumer-cooperative corporations, problems growing out of the wartime employment of women, et cetera. I have also done a small amount of labor arbitration.

My interest in good government led me early into the ranks of the League of Women Voters, of which I have been a member for almost 30 years and which I have served in many capacities and offices. It also led me into the Citizens Union of New York, of whose executive committee I have been a member for almost 20 years. When the American Labor Party was formed in New York I was one of its earliest members, but I left it after our efforts to save it from Communist domination finally failed.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, an exhibit, copies of which I am giving to all the members of the subcommittee; it is dated, the Daily News, Wednesday, February 14, 1940. It is announcing the setting up of a committee to fight the Communist attempt to capture the Labor Party, and I was one of the vice presidents of that organization.

Senator TYDINGS: Would you pause until we can look at the exhibit?

Miss KENYON: Yes.

Senator TYDINGS: Do you want to read it in, yourself?

Miss KENYON: No, no, I have read everything, Mr. Chairman, that is of importance; and I am leaving the whole statement with the exhibits attached. I have a number of other exhibits.

Senator TYDINGS: Just a moment.

Miss KENYON: Yes.

Senator TYDINGS: Miss Kenyon, would you be kind enough to identify for us, this document again, and to tell us in a brief way, for the information of the press, who may not have copies of it, and who want to know—briefly what is it all about?

Miss KENYON: Yes. It is a statement that appeared in the Daily News, a New York newspaper, on Wednesday, February 14, 1940, announcing the setting up of a liberal and labor committee to safeguard the American Labor Party and to fight the Communists' attempt to capture that labor party, and my name is there listed as one of the vice chairmen.

I am simply offering that as documentary evidence.

Senator TYDINGS: I think that identification is sufficient. It will be accepted as exhibit 49.

I will say to the press: I will leave a copy here on the table, as we have some extra ones, and should you gentlemen wish to familiarize yourselves with this to a greater extent, go ahead.

All right, Judge Kenyon, proceed.

Miss KENYON. I am now an enrolled Democrat. I am also a member of Americans for Democratic Action.

My interest in civil liberties led me equally early into the ranks of the American Civil Liberties Union, of which I have been a member of the board for almost 20 years. In that connection I have fought on many civil liberties issues and have participated in many briefs amicus in defense of the bill of rights.

My interest in education, in labor problems, and in the problems of women made me an early member of the American Association of University Women, of which I am now second vice president. I am also a member of the national board of the Young Women's Catholic Association, a director of the Women's City Club of New York, the Association for the Aid of Crippled Children, and the Committee of Women in World Affairs. I was also for many years on the board of the Consumers' League of New York and was for a time its president. I am also a member of numerous other women's organizations.

I am, and always have been, an independent, liberal Rooseveltian Democrat, devoted to and actively working for such causes as the improvement of the living and working conditions of labor and the preservation of civil liberties. To the latter cause especially I have given much time and attention and have made speeches on that subject for many years in various parts of the country. At times I have espoused unpopular causes in that connection and have probably made some enemies of those who disagreed with my views.

I am, and always have been, an ardent, outspoken American citizen, yielding to no one in my admiration of the great privileges this country offers to all its sons and daughters, and determined to do all I can to maintain those privileges inviolate forever. I am, and always have been, unalterably opposed to anyone who advocates the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, or who otherwise engages in subversive activities or entertains subversive ideas.

I am not content to rely on these general denials and observations, however, and I therefore proceed to deal more specifically with the charges against me. In substance, as I understand it, it is claimed that it can be established by documentary proof that I have been at some time a member of 28 or more Communist-front organizations and therefore stand convicted under the doctrine of guilt by association.

Thus far I have not been confronted with this documentary proof and as I am totally unaware of the contents of most of the documents, I am in no position to make any categorical denials or assertions regarding such statements as they may contain. Here and now, however, I can and do state, with the absolute confidence borne of my personal and positive knowledge, that there does not exist and never has existed any genuine document that proves, or even tends to prove, that I have ever knowingly joined or sponsored or participated in the activities of any organization known to me to be even slightly subversive.

Frankness and caution admonish me to avoid creating false impressions or otherwise putting myself in the position of the lady who protested too much. I cannot and do not deny that my name may have been used, even at times with my consent, in connection with organizations that later proved to be subversive but which, at the time, seemed to be engaged in activities or dedicated to objectives

which I could and did approve. Nevertheless I challenge and defy anyone to prove that I ever joined, or sponsored, or continued to identify myself with any organizations or individuals I knew, or had reason to believe, were subversive.

I do not even know the names of all the 23 or more Communist-front organizations I am supposed to have joined. I have taken the list of organizations from the published reports in the press. The names may not be quite accurate, and the list is apparently incomplete, or else my arithmetic is wrong. It is impossible for me to identify some of the names and events described in those charges. I have done the best I could, however, in the brief time since hearing of them and have searched my files, and my own memory in respect to each one. If any further organizations are alluded to today I shall ask the committee's indulgence for time to investigate and make my replies thereon at a later date.

Senator TYDINGS. That will be granted.

Miss KENYON. Thank you very much.

First, let me deny acquaintance with practically every one of the persons mentioned in the charges as being "familiar company" to me, "collaborator," or "fellow red." I do not know and have never to my knowledge laid eyes on Bernard J. Stern, Albert Maltz, Anna Louise Strong, William Gropper, Langston Hughes, Hewlett Johnson, Ben Gold, Lee Pressmen, Whittaker Chambers, Howard Fast, Saul Mills, Ella Winter, John Howard Lawson, Henry H. Collins, Rockwell Kent, Lewis Merrill, Mervyn Rathborne, Dirk J. Struick, Harry Bridges, Paul P. Crosbie, Benjamin J. Davis, Charles Krumbein, Morris V. Schappes, Simon W. Gerson, Louis Weinstock, Irving Potash, Helen Selden, or Josephine Herbst.

I once heard Paul Robeson sing at a concert. Harry F. Ward was, in the thirties—before its Communist purge—chairman of the board of the American Civil Liberties Union and I of course knew him there. Corliss Lamont is still on its board. I met Carol King years ago, before she went "left," but I have seen hardly anything of her in many years. Arthur Kallet's name I vaguely remember, as I vaguely remember Consumer's Union, but he and it date back in my memory at least 15 years and, if he were a Communist then, I did not know it.

I may be pardoned for putting the other names mentioned in a different category. They are Mrs. Dean Acheson, Stanley Isaacs, Philip Jessup, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I am proud to say I have had a slight acquaintance with them all.

To repeat, the rest are unknown to me, except as above mentioned, and the innuendoes as to my relationship with them absolutely false.

Now for the organizations themselves.

I begin with the League of Women Shoppers because my connection with that organization, which was set up to investigate labor disputes, is ancient history and it was also very short lived. Evelyn Preston Baldwin, wife of Roger Baldwin, and a close friend of mine, became its president at its founding in 1935 or thereabouts. I was a sponsor. We both withdrew a year or so later. I remember that I did so because I did not approve the way the investigations were being handled. If it was Communist then, neither of us knew about it.

The Political Prisoners' Bail Fund Committee is also ancient history.

I have no documentation on this organization in my files but I remember that I served as sponsor for a short time at the request of Roger Baldwin. Mr. Baldwin, who was a trustee of the fund, tells me that he and others set it up about 1925, to write bail in a great variety of worthy cases, some may possibly have involved Communists but most of them definitely did not. It was liquidated, he tells me, about 1934. He regarded it as wholly nonpartisan and non-Communist. It is significant that it is apparently not on any subversive list. It is described in the charges merely as subsidiary to the International Labor Defense, which is on the subversive list. The connection between them is not stated.

The Consumer's Union is also ancient history. I have never represented Consumer's Union. I had acted as attorney for Consumer's Research in its incorporation and for several years thereafter, prior to 1935, but I never acted for Consumer's Union. Consumer's Union came into existence, as I recall it, following a strike and split-up of the business into two organizations. They both test merchandise and give advice as to good buys. This is where I had my short acquaintance with Arthur Kallet. He was with Consumer's Research and, later, with Consumer's Union.

The Conference on Pan-American Democracy comes next. I find a letterhead in my file listing me as a sponsor of this organization, dated March 4, 1939, along with now Senator Paul A. Douglas, John Haynes Holmes, Quincy Howe, Stanley Isaacs, and Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, all friends of mine. I remember almost nothing about this organization except that I think I may have spoken before it in 1938 or thereabouts. I have never heard of it since. I certainly had no idea at that time that it was Communist, and I am sure my other sponsor friends had no such idea either.

Now for the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. I was never a member of this organization, but I became a sponsor of it—along with many distinguished people—at the height of the war effort—in 1943, I think it was—when the Russians were making their stand before Stalingrad and many of us believed that friendship with the people of Russia was both possible and good. I withdrew my sponsorship some 3 years later, when I had become convinced that the organization was no longer being used for the purposes stated in its title. Not long ago a friend told me that my name had not been removed from the sponsor's list as I had requested, and I wrote demanding its removal. I quote that letter:

GENTLEMEN: I am advised that you are still carrying my name on your letterhead as a sponsor of your organization.

I became a sponsor in 1943 or 1944 when the Germans were at the gates of Stalingrad and the United States was deep in admiration of the great courage of the Russian people. Anything which looked toward genuine friendship between the peoples of our two countries was highly desirable. Since then, however, your policy, as I have had occasion to observe it in the press, has had less and less to do with development of genuine friendship between the peoples of our two countries and more and more to do with mere apologetics for the Russian Government, which you have supported no less consistently than you have attacked the United States. This is no way to build friendship and it makes a mockery of your name and alleged purposes. My sponsorship of the council as a genuine organ of friendship between the peoples has therefore long since lapsed.

I have previously requested you to remove my name from your list of sponsors and I must now insist that you do so.

Sincerely yours.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder what the date of this letter is.

Miss KENYON. I have it here.

Senator TYDINGS. June 15, 1949.

Miss KENYON. I assume that my name has been removed by now, although I have no way of being sure. I have no apologies whatever for sponsoring this organization at the time I did and under those circumstances.

As indicative of the standing it had, it is significant that President Roosevelt himself sent a message of greeting to the council at its meeting on November 16, 1944, reading as follows:

I am grateful to you and all those who are celebrating American-Soviet Friendship Day for the words of support and confidence I have received. There is no better tribute we can hold out to our Allies than to continue working in ever-growing accord to establish a peace that will endure. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference was a step in this direction. Other steps will be taken. In line with this objective such meetings as you are holding in Madison Square Garden and in other great centers throughout the United States are of tremendous assistance and value.

It is also significant that President Truman followed it up by another greeting on November 14, 1945, reading as follows:

The President has asked me to extend to you every good wish for the success of the meeting and to assure you of his interest in all efforts to continue the good relations between this country and the Soviet Union.

As for the Red Dean of Canterbury, I certainly never welcomed him at Madison Square Garden or anywhere else.

I never met him. I surmise that the fact that my name remained on the sponsor list longer than it should have is the explanation of this incident.

I have no recollection of sponsoring the dinner in question but, since it was given in honor of President Roosevelt, it would not seem inappropriate had I done so.

American Lawyers' Committee on American Relations with Spain: Now for the group connected with Spain. This committee was apparently working early in 1939 to lift the embargo on Spain, which was defeated by the combined efforts of revolutionary forces within that country plus Hitler and Mussolini. This organization is not on any subversive list that I can find, and I was on it.

Washington Committee To Lift the Spanish Embargo: As for the Washington committee I can find nothing on this in my files and I have no recollection whatsoever.

The Abraham Lincoln Brigade probably belongs in here too. I have no recollection or documentation for this whatever. Furthermore, if the petition which they say I signed really contained a charge that war hysteria was being whipped up by the Roosevelt administration, it is inconceivable that I could have signed it, since I myself was then passionately pro-ally and in process of trying to force our Government into greater and greater activity in their behalf rather than less. I refer to that matter later.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom: I have no recollection or documentation in respect to signing a petition in my files. I do have correspondence, however, showing that in 1940 I accepted membership on a citizens' committee to promote free public education. The letterhead lists many distinguished col-



lege presidents and professors, including Miss Park, the former president of Bryn Mawr, and Prof. Harold Urey. This organization is not on the Attorney General's list.

Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights: I can find nothing on this in my files, and I have no recollection of it, but I find a press clipping reporting a meeting held in New York February 15, 1940, at which Newbold Morris and Mary Woolley, former president of Mount Holyoke College, were listed as speakers.

Advisory Board of Film Audiences for Democracy, and Advisory Board of Films for Democracy: I can find nothing on either of these organizations in my files, and there is nothing in my memory. I may possibly have made a speech before them. Neither of them are on any subversive list that I can find.

Schappes Defense Committee; Daily Worker Letter on Simon W. Gerson; American Committee for Anti-Nazi Literature; Advisory Committee of the Citizens' Committee To Aid Striking Seamen; and Milk Consumers' Protective Committee: I can find nothing on any of these matters in my files and have no memory of them except a vague recollection of the Gerson and Schappes controversies. If I participated in either of them in any way I have completely forgotten it and I am certain that I never approved or endorsed Communist activities in those or any other matters.

Congress of American Women: This is one organization I know something about. It is the American affiliate of the Women's International Democratic Federation, a wholly Moscow controlled body over which I have been battling with Mme. Popova of the USSR at the United Nations for all the years since the creation of the Commission on the Status of Women. To charge me with membership in this organization is nothing short of fantastic.

This completes the roster of specific charges.

One general charge remains, my "constant adherence to the \* \* \* party line," as evidenced by this alleged multiplicity of associations, actually boiled down to a handful and most of them before 1940. Well, how about it? Is this all I have done? Is this the whole of my life? Emphatically, no. I have done many other things, some of them strangely inconsistent with the party line, some of them in flat contradiction to it. Let's look at the record in the round and not just a distorted fragment.

In the early years of my life I knew very little and cared less about Communists. They were an utterly negligible factor in my life. During the thirties, however, as world tension increased, they began showing their hand, and by the end of that period, I, like others, had come to know and loathe their philosophy. The signing of the Hitler-Stalin pact in October 1939 suddenly made the issues startlingly clear. I voiced those issues in a letter I wrote to Alex Rose, secretary of the American Labor Party, under date of October 10, 1939, as a statement for him to use in conjunction with my candidacy as judge of the municipal court:

Senator TYDINGS. One minute, Judge Kenyon, please.

Miss KENTON. May I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

Senator TYDINGS. Just a second, please.

Miss KENTON. There are three particularly important paragraphs.

Senator TYDINGS. Do you want to put the whole thing in the record?

Miss KENYON. Yes; but I would like to read now the significant paragraphs.

Senator TYDINGS. Go right ahead. This will be exhibit 50.

Miss KENYON (reading):

First, I regard with horror and loathing the Hitler-Stalin pact.

Second, I agree with you that any fusing of the brown and red dictatorships is a treacherous blow to world civilization.

Third, I also agree, insofar as I understand them, with the President's proposed changes in our present neutrality law. But frankly I have been far too busy lately trying to be as good a judge as possible to have given such legislation the careful study it requires.

Fourth, it is not easy for me to be neutral when I think of either Hitler or Stalin but I try not to lose my head and I continue to believe in the traditional American civil liberties. Above all I hope that we may keep at peace and still preserve American democracy.

Fifth, it goes without saying (or I should have thought it did) that I am not a Communist or anything even remotely resembling one. I am just an old-fashioned believer in democracy who gets awfully weary sometimes of all its ructions but would never, never give it up.

Senator TYDINGS. That is dated October 10, 1939?

Miss KENYON. Yes; that is right.

Events moved so quickly after that, by February 1940, we had been forced to form a liberal and labor committee, of which I was a member, vice president, to safeguard the American Labor Party and to fight the Communist attempt to capture it.

I have already presented you with that document, Mr. Chairman.

At the same time the American Civil Liberties Union found it necessary to purge from its own board all nonbelievers in civil liberties. This action barred from its governing councils anyone "who is a member of any political organization which supports totalitarian dictatorship in any country, or who by his public declarations indicates his support of such a principle." Within this category we include organizations in the United States supporting the totalitarian governments of the Soviet Union and of the Fascist and Nazi countries—such as the Communist Party and the German-American Bund and others; as well as native organizations with obvious antidemocratic objectives and practises. Needless to say, I was not one of those purged, and I am still a member of that board.

The Communist party line in 1940-41 was antiwar, anti-French and anti-British. But that was not my line. Being, on the contrary, passionately pro-French and pro-British I became increasingly anxious to aid them as the months passed by, first by all means short of war and later by war itself if need be.

I was one of the original members of the so-called William Allen White Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. William Allen White in a telegram invited me to join, saying:

Here is a life and death struggle for every principle we cherish in America, for freedom of speech, of religion, of the ballot, and of every freedom that upholds the dignity of the human spirit. Here all the rights that the common man has fought for during a thousand years are menaced. Terrible as it may seem, the people of our country cannot avoid the consequences of Hitler's victory or of those who are or may be allied with him. A totalitarian victory would wipe out hope for a just and lasting peace.

I submit a copy of the complete telegram of William Allen White.

Senator TYDINGS. And the date of that is June 19, 1940?

Miss KENYON. June 19, 1940.

I think the telegram was sent a bit before that, but that was after the committee was organized.

I favored giving Great Britain overage destroyers, I favored lend-lease, selective service, et cetera, et cetera. I made many speeches during that period extolling freedom, urging aid to the Allies and criticizing the isolationists and the Communists alike for their opposition.

On May 26, 1941—a month before Hitler attacked Russia—I joined with other members of that committee in an open letter to the President of the United States, in effect inviting him to declare war on the dictators. It read in part:

We cannot close our eyes to the wholesale murder of liberty \* \* \* The dictators have extended their world war and world revolution from continent to continent \* \* \* The challenge is inescapable. We know that strong action, even armed action, will be required of us.

This was signed, among many others, by Mrs. J. Borden Harriman and Ambassador Lewis W. Douglas.

I am attaching a photostat of that letter.

Shall I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

Senator TYDINGS. You may proceed. That will be exhibit 51.

Miss KENYON. All right, thank you.

This history of my efforts during the crucial years 1940-41 hardly needs any gloss but it should give pause to those who dare to call me a Communist.

After Russia had been attacked we all changed our viewpoint slightly and many of us made earnest efforts to be friends with our new allies. I do not apologize for that impulse or effort. I think it was right and good.

However, we failed. When the war ended the cold war began and it is intensifying. I have been in the thick of it. Confronted with Madame Popova of the U. S. S. R. at the United Nations I have had a fight on my hands from the outset. At the first meeting of our Commission on the Status of Women held in February 1947, she sought preferential treatment for her particular pet organization, the Women's International Democratic Federation—of which the Congress of American Women is the United States affiliate. I battled her on eight different occasions during that first meeting on that one issue alone, practically single-handed since most of the other delegates did not yet know what it was all about. They know now, however. The reports and summary records of the Commission's proceedings tell the tale.

The struggle went on at subsequent commission meetings. It reached its peak at Beirut, Lebanon, last spring—see New York Times clipping of March 26, 1949, which I have here to present to you.

Senator TYDINGS. Do you want to put that in the record at this point?

Miss KENYON. We only have the one copy.

Senator TYDINGS. Put that in the record at this point, if you have the original copy.

Miss KENYON. Yes.

Senator McMAHON. Are you mentioned in that clipping?

Miss KENYON. Certainly. Madame Popova and I are it.

Senator TYDINGS. Just hold up for a moment, please.

Senator GREEN. I request that it be put in.

Senator TYDINGS. It has been requested, Judge Kenyon, if you do not mind, if you identify the article by the paper in which it appeared, and the date under which it appeared, and read the article into the record.

Miss KENYON. You want me to read it now?

Senator TYDINGS. If you please.

Miss KENYON. There are two of them.

Senator TYDINGS. Two?

Miss KENYON. One is dated March 26, 1949, and the other is dated December 16, 1948.

Shall I read the first one first?

Senator TYDINGS. I think it would be wiser if you were to read the first one first.

Do you have a copy of the first one?

Miss KENYON. I have, but not of the second one.

This, Mr. Chairman, appeared in the New York Times under date of Thursday, December 16, 1948, and this is a speech I made in New York City.

The headline says: "Dorothy Kenyon says women's equality with men in Russia is one of slavery."

"Women in Russia undoubtedly have more equality in a greater variety of jobs than do American women, but it is an equality of slavery," Dorothy Kenyon, United States delegate to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, declared here yesterday.

At a luncheon of the Women's City Club of New York at the New Weston Hotel, Miss Kenyon charged that statements by Prof. A. P. Pavlov and other Soviet Union delegates at recent United Nations sessions that women in the United States and Great Britain were living in slavery were for political consumption abroad. She said non-Russian delegates were placed on the defensive, and she intended to take the offensive at the next commission meeting.

"The Russians have made a lot of noise about equality, but I wonder whether women there are any more in the driver's seat than they are in this country," she said. "I have never been able to discover any Soviet woman, except for Alexandra Kollontay, for many years their Minister to Sweden, in a position of real power."

Pointing out there never had been a woman member of the Politburo and that there was now none either on the central committee of the Communist Party, she said the Russians made much propaganda of the fact that 21 percent of the Supreme Soviet is made up of women. But she contended that this was of no significance, as the body sits only a few days a year for unanimous approval of Government proposals. In newspaper pictures of Moscow celebrations, she declared, "there are not even women used as window-dressing."

Although she said the United States should place more women in the Cabinet and have more Representatives in Congress, Miss Kenyon pointed out that at least here they were not prevented from running for office. But in Russia, she declared, "not one of our Russian sisters has run for election as we know it," but are merely handpicked if the Communist Party chooses them to run.

"If women are to achieve recognition as equal citizens the world over, we had better admit our difficulties and team up to help each other meet them," she declared. "Paper participation in government is too flimsy a foundation to advance the principles of democracy or of women's rights."

Shall I read the next one now, Mr. Chairman?

Senator TYDINGS. What is the committee's pleasure?

Senator McMAHON. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. Yes, read the next one.

Miss KENYON. This is a little long.

It was before I went to Lebanon.

Senator TYDINGS. Identify the article, please.

Miss KENYON. This appeared in the New York Times under date of Saturday, March 26, 1949.

The headlines are "United States, Soviet women clash on rights of wives of foreigners under Russian restrictions."

Then, it says:

BEIRUT, LEBANON, March 25.—A long and bitter attack on the United States by Soviet delegate Elizaveta A. Popova was strongly opposed here today by other delegates of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. These delegates included Judge Dorothy Kenyon of the United States who pleaded that the commission be permitted to get on with its work.

The Soviet representative's criticism of alleged racial discrimination and other faults of United States society followed Judge Kenyon's presentation of a proposal for the convention to guarantee women's freedom to choose their nationality. The aim of the proposal is to adjust the tangle of legislation that endangers women's status through international marriage, she said.

Judge Kenyon again brought into the foreground the reason for the Soviet opposition, which had caused a crisis previously in the commission's transactions—the Russian refusal to permit Soviet citizens married to foreigners to reside abroad with their husbands.

Describing this policy as an outrageous limitation on the rights of women, Judge Kenyon said that in addition to the Russian wives of British subjects there were now 350 Russian wives of United States citizens who could not leave Russia with their husbands and 65 Russian husbands of American girls who were equally restricted.

The principal business of the present meeting has been to lay the groundwork for a convention and the implementation of treaties to disentangle the maze of conflicting regulations of various countries on the subject of a woman's nationality after marriage to a man of another nationality.

The United Nations Secretariat has prepared elaborate studies of the law and treaties. However, the Soviet delegate rejected the whole project before discussion of any data had begun. She said:

"This is not a matter for the Commission on the Status of Women to study. Our problem is discrimination against women. Why was this problem brought to our attention at all?"

She then charged discrimination in the United States and gave no further attention to the nationality issue. She said that 15 States of the United States prohibited mixed marriages between Negroes and whites, that 5 prohibited marriages with Malays and 5 with Indians, and demanded to know where the principle of women's freedom of choice existed in the United States.

She added that in some States officials were punished for issuing licenses for mixed marriages and that in Mississippi any propaganda for mixed marriages or even equality was prohibited.

Judge Kenyon indicated that only recognition of a woman's right to choose her own nationality as freely as man would be the solution. This view was opposed later by a spokesman for the Catholic Feminine League who pleaded for the principle of unity of the family. She said that a man and a woman were not equal in all things, though equal in dignity, and that they had different functions in society.

The commission adopted a resolution calling for investigation by the United Nations of the application to women throughout the world of penal and police procedure. This is expected to be opposed by Russia since it would involve an investigation of penal labor camps.

That is the conclusion of that, Mr. Chairman.

May I proceed?

Senator TYDINGS. You may proceed.

Miss KENYON. The culmination of it was when, after bitter debate over many things, including equal pay for equal work, I finally demanded of Mme. Popova whether women received equal pay for equal work in the Soviet slave labor camps.

The issue was always slavery versus freedom. I raised the point over and over again in writing, speeches, at meetings, even over the Voice of America.

Eventually Moscow answered back. Maria Sharikova, assistant chairman of the Moscow Soviet on the rights of women is reported on January 5, 1949, to have said:

Dorothy Kenyon, in endeavoring to conceal her reactionary stand has engaged in slandering the Soviet people, in particular Soviet women. In a radio broadcast over the Voice of America, she talks a lot of irresponsible drivel attempting to deny the political, economic, and social equality enjoyed by the women of the U. S. S. R., at the same time painting a glowing picture of the position of women in Britain and the United States, when she knows full well what their position really is. "I am shocked at this shameful downright lie, completely unsupported by the tiniest fact." As it happens, Dorothy Kenyon could not quote facts for that would at once disprove her assertions.

Dorothy Kenyon had engaged in slandering the "freest women on earth, the women of the U. S. S. R." However, as any of the thousands of visitors to the U. S. S. R. can witness, "the slander indulged in by Dorothy Kenyon can hoodwink no one."

Mr. Chairman, I offer that entire gem in evidence as exhibit 52. That is a State Department release quoting that release from Moscow in toto.

This is my defense. What does it add up to? With all the mistakes and errors of judgment which the best of us can and do commit only too frequently, I submit that the record proves without question that I am a lover of democracy, of individual freedom and of human rights for everybody, a battler, perhaps a little bit too much of a battler sometimes, for the rights of the little fellow, the under dog, the fellow who gets forgotten or frightened or shunned because of unpopular views; but who is a human being just the same and entitled to be treated like one. The converse of these things; dictatorship, cruelty, oppression, and slavery are to me intolerable. I cannot live in their air; I must fight back. This is not perhaps a very wise or prudent way to live but it is my way. It has got me into hot water before and probably will again. But my faith in people and my impulse to fight for them is my religion and it is the light by which I live. I also believe that it is America. There is not a Communist bone in my body.

This is a matter of grave consequence to me. Literally overnight, whatever personal and professional reputation and standing I may have acquired after many years in private practice and some in public office, they have been seriously jeopardized, if not destroyed by the widespread dissemination of charges of Communistic leanings or proclivities that are utterly false. The truth may never catch up with the lie, but insofar as I can, I desire to regain as much of what I have lost as possible and I have faith that this subcommittee will see that justice is done. Of course, I am more than willing to attempt to answer any questions the members of this subcommittee, or anyone permitted by the subcommittee, may care to ask. I conclude with an expression of my appreciation of the opportunity and privilege afforded me so promptly, to answer these charges at this public hearing.

Senator TYRINGS. I will ask our guests, no matter what the testimony may be, whether it pleases them or displeases them, to kindly refrain from any applause or any other demonstration, because if we permit it in one case, we will have to permit it in another, and we are trying to conduct a very careful investigation and we would appreciate if those who come, no matter what your impulses may be, would not give us any demonstration.

Senator Hickenlooper, would you like to ask the witness any questions?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to canvass the situation a little bit with Judge Kenyon.

I want to say, at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that I told the committee that while I thought it was perfectly proper to have Judge Kenyon come here and make such a statement as she cared to make, that I felt that no adequate or satisfactory canvass of the situation surrounding the accusations of Judge Kenyon's membership in these organizations which have been declared subversive by various public bodies, could be had without full and complete access, prior access to the investigative files in connection with Judge Kenyon.

The committee has not seen fit to produce those investigating files for my perusal at this point, so that I feel that any examination at this time, while perhaps eventually adequate, I cannot be certain that it has a sufficient background of all the facts upon which to base questions, but I do have some questions I would like to ask Judge Kenyon if I may.

In the first place, I would like to canvass some of these organizations, and I may say, Mr. Chairman, that my questions are based entirely upon my understanding that Senator McCarthy did not charge Judge Kenyon with being personally subversive or with being a Communist. I believe the charges went to the point of charging her with membership in a substantial number of organizations which have been declared subversive by various public bodies.

Senator TYDINGS. May I interrupt?

Senator GREEN. May I reply to that?

Senator TYDINGS. Let me read the resolution.

Senator GREEN. May I reply to that point?

Senator TYDINGS. All right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. May you reply? I am stating my understanding.

Senator GREEN. I think you have misunderstood the purpose of the resolution, which was read at the beginning of this hearing.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize and direct us to investigate charges of disloyalty, so the charges that were made against Miss Kenyon were charges of disloyalty. That is what she directed her answers to, and it seems to me that further questions ought to be directed to that point.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do I understand that the Senator—

Senator TYDINGS. Just a minute. There is evidently a dispute here. Let the chairman read the resolution himself, and he will take no further part in it:

That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are or have been employed by the Department of State.

Proceed.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. If the subcommittee is to be limited to the very artful interpretation that is now apparently put on the resolution, then I certainly should be handicapped and completely limited in the questions I think should be asked in the general public interest of examining this matter.

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead with your question.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Judge, I believe that you were alleged to have been a member of the Consumers National Federation Conference Committee, or the Consumers National Federation, which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, and in 1943, by the California Committee on Un-American Activities; and by the New York City Council Committee on Investigating the Municipal Civil Service Commission.

I have a photostat, alleging that it is copied—

Miss KENYON. Give me the name again, Senator, because I have not heard that name before.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Consumers National Federation. I have a photostat of your name among the list of individual sponsors of that organization.

Miss KENYON. And the date?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. December 11 and 12, 1937, apparently this document was published. You may see it if you like.

Miss KENYON. I would be very happy to, yes.

This, Mr. Chairman, is not one of the organizations which was in the public print that I had, that was released last week. I remember nothing about it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The list of names is on the second page.

Miss KENYON. Yes.

I will tell you, Senator, what I remember, if I have got the name correct, because there are an awful lot of names that are very confusing, and it is difficult to tell.

I have a recollection of a group concerned with consumers' problems that was formed around the middle of the thirties, about this date, probably, and that I went and made a speech at one of their meetings, and that I was probably perhaps connected with for a little while and later I decided that I did not like the tone or complexion or company that I was keeping, and I got out very early and washed my hands of it and never had anything to do with it for many, many years.

I do not know what my files may show, but that is my recollection.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you have any recollection of that particular organization, or your sponsorship?

Miss KENYON. That is what I say I think I am talking about—that organization. That is my recollection—of one where I did not like the company. I went and made a speech and did not like the company I was keeping and after a very few months, I got out and had nothing further to do with it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you recall whether you got out by writing a letter of resignation, or just not going?

Miss KENYON. I cannot recall anything about that. I only know, Senator, my recollection is I washed my hands of it long ago, because I suspected the people. I will be very glad to look it up in my files and see if I can find anything further.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. As far as you recall, you attended just one meeting of the organization?

Miss KENYON. That is right. That is what I remember—making a speech on consumers' problems, a very good speech and they liked it, and I think they asked me to be a sponsor. That was my misfortune.



Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you recall the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, in New York City?

Miss KENYON. I think I made a speech there. That was not one of the names given by Senator McCarthy last week, this is a new one on me.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have a photostat, alleged to be a copy of the list of sponsoring people, and you are listed as Dorothy Kenyon, former justice, New York City. This organization was cited as a Communist front by the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1942 and 1944; by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, in their report in 1948; cited as subversive and un-American by the special committee of the House Committee on Appropriations, April 21, 1943.

Miss KENYON. What is that? I beg your pardon, I do not want to interrupt.

What did you say; what was the date allegedly of my participation?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You understand, I have no first-hand knowledge, and these are alleged to be photostatic copies of the documents.

Miss KENYON. I understand.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. This is dated, according to the photostat, January 17, 1940. Your name appears on the second page of the photostat, if you care to see it—you may.

Miss KENYON. Wait a minute. I am afraid I am confused about this. What is the name of that organization?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

Miss KENYON. Oh, I beg your pardon. It is one of the ones I mentioned, Senator, and I have a statement in my file. I just read my statement in respect to that. I said that what I did, according to my record, was to accept membership on a citizens' committee to promote free public education. The letterhead lists many distinguished college presidents, including Miss Park, former president of Bryn Mawr, and Professor Urey.

I also believe I am correct in saying that the organization is not on the Attorney General's list. It had an astounding number of presidents of colleges on it—most impressive.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Would you look at this alleged photostat and see if you are referring specifically to that organization whose name appears at the top? There are some of these organizations having similar names.

Miss KENYON. "President Marion Park, Bryn Mawr College; Prof. Harold Urey." This is the same one, yes. There are lots of other college presidents there too—very fine gentlemen.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did you withdraw from this organization?

Miss KENYON. I had nothing to do with it, sir, according to my records, except to serve for a short period on this Committee to Promote Free Public Education—just one single ad hoc committee for one specific job. I don't know what we did.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You are not connected with it now, then?

Miss KENYON. I never have been since 1940, if that is the date on it. I was only connected with it then to that extent.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have another photostat of an alleged program of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalien-

able Rights. This is Monday, February 12, 1940. The photostat is alleged to be of a list of members of the general committee. This organization is cited as a Communist front, which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. That citation was by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in their report March 29, 1944; also cited by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, report No. 115, September 2, 1947; cited as a Communist front by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, report, 1948.

Do you recall that organization?

Miss KENYON. Yes. I have mentioned that already, to say that all my records showed, and it must be the same meeting that you are talking about—was a meeting held in New York. I thought it was February 15, 1940, and Newbold Morris, who is not mayor of New York, and Mary Woolley, former president of Mount Holyoke College, were listed as the speakers in this clipping that I had.

Senator TYDINGS. Who is Newbold Morris, so we will know who he is.

Miss KENYON. He was president of the city council for 12 years when Mayor LaGuardia was president. He ran last fall for mayor against Mayor O'Dwyer. He is a liberal too.

Senator GREEN. In order that the record may be complete, on what ticket did Mr. Morris run for mayor?

Miss KENYON. Well, Senator, I think he ran on the Republican ticket. That is probably why I voted for O'Dwyer.

Excuse me, Senator Hickenlooper.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I notice it is the occasional Republican who belongs to one of these organizations that can be pointed to.

Mr. KIENDL. I am on your side on that, Senator.

Miss KENYON. Guilty by association.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Is this organization still in existence that you know of?

Miss KENYON. What, this Inalienable Rights?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. This Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights.

Miss KENYON. I haven't the faintest idea. I can't even remember it. All I can find was this clipping in my files, 1940.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now the testimonial dinner in honor of Ferdinand C. Smith, on September 20, 1944, at the Hotel Commodore, in New York. I have a photostat alleging to be a copy of the list of sponsors containing your name. Were you a sponsor of that organization?

Miss KENYON. I haven't any recollection. That is also a new one on me. It wasn't included in the list that Senator McCarthy gave last year. When was that, and what was the man's name?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. September 20, 1944, testimonial dinner in honor of Ferdinand C. Smith at the Hotel Commodore in New York. You may see this, if it will refresh your memory.

Miss KENYON. Thank you very much. Was he a Negro?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I don't know. The allegation was made, I believe, that he is a prominent Communist.

Miss KENYON. Do you mean at the dinner?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I don't know about at the dinner.

Miss KENYON. Excuse me a moment. I don't remember anything about this. I haven't any recollection of it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Your name is on the second page.

Miss KENYON. Yes, "in recognition of his outstanding service to labor, the Negro people, and the Nation."

I may have fallen for the fact that he is a member of the Negro race. That was a mistake like LaGuardia's occasional mistakes. It was a beaut.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you recall attending the dinner?

Miss KENYON. I don't know the individual. I don't recall having attended the dinner. I don't go to dinners if I can help myself.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The American Committee for Anti-Nazi Literature, suite 302, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. The photostat is alleged to be a copy of a letter, or photostat of the letterhead of that organization, upon which your name appears as a sponsor.

Miss KENYON. What is the date? May I see it?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. March 24, 1939. You may see it, of course.

Miss KENYON. I reported on this in my statement. I said I could find absolutely nothing in my files in regard to it, sir. I see a number of friends of mine along here on this sponsor list, including Prof. John Dewey. I just sponsored a dinner for him this fall. And Lillian Wald, who is also on the board of the American Civil Liberties Union, and Professor MacIver.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you have any recollection of it?

Miss KENYON. No.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And you are not now a member of it, nor a sponsor?

Miss KENYON. Certainly not.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have an alleged photostatic copy of a clipping of the Daily Worker of February 10, 1944, containing a story which I shall show you, headed as follows: "Leading citizens laud Isaacs' on Gerson," and it is alleged to be a letter of which they claim you were one of the signers, in this news story, a letter to Mr. Isaacs lauding the appointment of S. W. Gerson, former Daily Worker reporter, as an assistant on Mr. Isaacs' staff.

They print your name as one of the signers of that letter.

Miss KENYON. A Daily Worker clipping, you say? I never see that sheet.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that I could find nothing in my record in respect to Gerson, or any letter or any action of mine in respect to it, and I have no recollection of anything except the Gerson controversy itself, which I remember, but the thing that seems to me extraordinary is that if my memory is right, that Gerson incident was in 1937 and this is dated 1944. It may not be a very good paper, but news 7 years old seems a little stale. I would suspect it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I don't know, Judge. You are the one who either has the recollection or does not have the recollection, and I am merely asking whether you have any recollection or whether you did sign such a letter or not.

Miss KENYON. I have no recollection, and this seems to me incredible.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have heard that term before.

Miss KENYON. I did not mean to plagiarize.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In spite of the general sentiment, there is no monopoly on the term.

Miss KENYON. It is like "warmongering."

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now I have a photostat of an alleged news story in the Daily Worker of February 21, 1940, in which your name appears as the signer of a protest to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson, protesting the attacks upon the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and condemning the war hysteria now being whipped up by the Roosevelt administration. I show you the photostat. I have no knowledge of it whatsoever.

Miss KENYON. Thank you very much. I have already commented on that. I will just take a look at it now.

So far as I know, I have already referred to this, to say that I have absolutely no recollection of having done anything of the sort, and I will say this time it is simply preposterous in relation to my record, which was almost that of warmongering at that time. It is undoubtedly a complete and absolute falsehood.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I take it that you are quite positive that you did not sign such a protest?

Miss KENYON. I am as positive as I can be.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The National Citizens Political Action Committee. Do you recall that organization?

Miss KENYON. I believe that that was the organization of which Sidney Hillman was the head, and I was very happy to be a member of the PAC. I regarded him as a great labor leader and a great citizen and American. I don't need to look at the documentation on that, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You well remember that organization?

Miss KENYON. Quite.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have a photostat here of a page of the Daily Worker of February 10, 1944, headed "American women leaders greet colleagues in U. S. S. R."

Miss KENYON. Has that a picture of Dorothy Thompson in the middle of the page?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It has a picture of Miss Thompson.

Miss KENYON. I remember that very well indeed. I am proud to say I did send greetings along with Dorothy Thompson and a lot of other fine women to the brave women of Russia, who at that time were our allies and were putting up a wonderful fight. Dorothy Thompson and I both remember it very well, and we are very proud of the fact that we did it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That was at the National Council of Soviet-American Friendship; is that true?

Miss KENYON. I don't know anything about that. We just sent greetings as individuals. I did not belong to that organization.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You did not?

Miss KENYON. No. I understood we were invited as individuals to join in a Christmas greeting and we did—a lot of us. I think Mrs. Ogden Reid, of the Herald Tribune, was on it too.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe you recall the Political Prisoners Bail Fund Committee in your State; do you not?

Miss KENYON. Yes, Senator. I have very little recollection of it myself. I mostly got it from Mr. Baldwin.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have here an alleged photostatic copy of a letterhead dated January 18, 1935, of the Political Prisoners Bail Fund Committee, 154 Nassau Street, room 1200, New York City, and your name is printed on the side of this alleged photostat as one of the sponsors. Is that correct?

Miss KENYON. I believe so; yes. Mr. Baldwin's name appears there as trustee; is that correct?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Baldwin is the first named as trustee.

Miss KENYON. Perhaps I had better look at it.

Yes, that is the one. I see Heywood Broun's name there too.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. How long were you a member of that organization?

Miss KENYON. It died in 1934 or 1935. This must have been its death agony, I guess. That is what Mr. Baldwin told me. I have no recollection of it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You are not a member of it at this time?

Miss KENYON. It liquidated 15 years ago, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It was cited as subversive and Communist June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948. It was called a legal arm of the Communist Party by Attorney General Francis Biddle, according to the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942. It was cited as "It is essentially the legal defense arm of the Communist Party of the United States" by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, reports, January 3, 1939; also cited in reports, January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944, and again by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947. I have no knowledge as to whether or not it is still in existence, but those are the citations.

Miss KENYON. Senator, I believe you have confused it with the International Labor Defense. I think what you have been reading about is the record of the International Labor Defense, with which I never had anything to do, and it was, so far as I know, the arm of the Communist Party.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The Political Prisoners Bail Fund Committee is alleged to be a subsidiary of the International Labor Defense, which has been characterized as I have just given you by those reports.

Miss KENYON. Yes, but I gave you Roger Baldwin's report, which is to the contrary, and there is no evidence that it is a subsidiary that I know of, and I have Mr. Baldwin's statement to the contrary. That is the best I can do in respect to that, Senator.

So far as I am concerned, I have forgotten every single thing about it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have a photostat of a letter headed "Lawyers Committee on American Relations With Spain." This is dated March 5, 1938. Your name is carried on the photostat, apparently in a list of members. At the bottom of the list it says "(partial list)."

Miss KENYON. Will you give me the name again? I think I have covered it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Lawyers Committee on American Relations With Spain.

Miss KENYON. Yes, I covered that and said that I belonged to that. That was in 1938-39, and the purpose of that was, we were working to get the embargo against the Government of Spain lifted. If you re-

call the situation at that time, the policy of nonintervention I believe was in effect, and was practiced by everybody except Hitler and Mussolini, and I have a good deal of good company in that list. I also could not find that organization on any subversive list. It must have gone out of existence.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe you will find that it was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 19, 1944, pages 168-169, as "When it was the policy of the Communist Party to organize much of its main propaganda around the civil war in Spain" the above "Communist lawyers' front organization" supported this movement.

It was cited as a Communist front, I believe, by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, in their report, 1948, page 335.

Cited, I believe, also by the New York City Council committee investigating the municipal civil service commission.

Miss KENYON. I have told you that I was a member of it in 1939, for that one specific purpose. There are a great many very fine American citizens also included on that list. I had no knowledge whatsoever that it was Communist at the time, and I am not sure of it yet.

I have had nothing to do with it since 1939.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It is not in existence, so far as you know, at this time?

Miss KENYON. I understood it was formed for that one purpose, and then it went out of existence.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have a photostatic copy of an alleged political advertisement in the New York Times of October 9, 1944, entitled "An Open Letter to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey" in connection with the Morris U. Schappes' conviction and asking the Governor to pardon Mr. Schappes. Your name is listed in this alleged photostat of the advertisement as one of the signers of the open letter.

Miss KENYON. I covered that in my statement. I will be very glad to look at it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think there is a pencil mark right there at your name.

Miss KENYON. I have absolutely no recollection of that whatever, Senator. That is one of the matters which I tried to see if I could find something on to refresh my recollection. I found absolutely nothing. I remember a long debate in regard to this Schappes case, and I think the American Civil Liberties Union had the matter under advisement in respect to a number of possible aspects of civil liberties in connection with the matter. Of course, in connection with civil liberties, as you know, we are always having cases come before us where it is charged that there has been some violation of civil liberties, and it is one of the basic tenets of the American Civil Liberties Union that every person is entitled to civil liberties, even if we hate his ideas.

I have no recollection of this or myself having taken any action whatsoever. If I did take any action, it would have been entirely because of some civil liberties question which I believed was involved. Frankly, I don't think I took any action at all. I think I just chewed the rag the way a lot of others did.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Then, the inclusion of your name in that advertisement as one of the sponsors was entirely without your consent or approval; would you say?

Miss KENYON. No, I can't be sure of that. I simply say I cannot remember. If it was included, it was only included because of some civil liberties aspect of the matter so far as I was concerned, but I have no recollection.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The Schappes Defense Committee has been listed by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944, as a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York. It was listed as a front organization, I am informed, by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in its report in 1948, page 55.

Miss KENYON. Mr. Senator, I take it that you are not charging that I was a member of that committee, but simply that I signed the letter. Is that correct?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Miss Kenyon, I am charging nothing.

Miss KENYON. I beg your pardon.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am asking for information.

Miss KENYON. Yes, yes. To clarify, let me say I know I never was a member of the committee.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I do not allege that this photostat shows any membership on anything, except it is alleged that you were a signer of the so-called open letter to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey as contained in a political advertisement of that date.

Miss KENYON. And that I may have done, although I doubt it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you recall the Washington Committee To Lift the Spanish Embargo?

Miss KENYON. No. I mentioned that, and I said I could find absolutely nothing whatsoever about it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have a photostatic copy of an alleged list of sponsors, I presume, of this organization; I don't know. It is headed "These Americans say: 'Lift the Embargo Against Republican Spain.'". It is a booklet of the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo, an auxiliary of North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

Under the heading "Lawyers" is listed "Judge Dorothy Kenyon."

Miss KENYON. Well, I was fighting for that cause. I wanted the embargo lifted.

This is one of the causes, Senator, for which I fought. It says, "These Americans say: 'Lift the Embargo Against Republican Spain.'" They say they want the embargo lifted. I did.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You signed that?

Miss KENYON. That was 1939, was it not?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe it so.

Miss KENYON. Yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Then I have a photostat of an alleged page in the New York Times of January 31, 1949, entitled "An Open Letter to the Government and the People of the United States," demanding that they lift the embargo now.

Miss KENYON. You mean 1939, not 1949.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did I say 1949? I'm sorry; 1939. And at the bottom of this is a list of names, in which your name appears.

Miss KENYON. I suppose that is the same thing, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I don't know.

Miss KENYON. There are an awful lot of bishops on this. This is what I was for. I see some very respectable lawyers of New York on there. Harold Riegelman's name is there.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The Washington Committee to Lift the Spanish Embargo, I am informed, was cited as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish civil war by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation. That citation is by the Special Committee On Un-American Activities, report March 29, 1944, pages 137 and 138.

Cited as a Communist front by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, report, 1947, page 210, according to the information I have.

Miss KENYON. I certainly had no idea it was Communist, and I am sure those other Republican New York lawyers did not know it either.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Can't you find any Democratic lawyers on that list?

Miss KENYON. I think my counsel will be glad to.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Here is a photostatic copy, allegedly, of a letterhead of Films For Democracy, 342 Madison Avenue, New York. Listed on the side as a member of the advisory board is the name of Dorothy Kenyon.

Miss KENYON. I have reported on that already. I will be glad to see the exhibit.

I have absolutely no recollection. I see Stanley Iaacs' name here. I thought perhaps I might have made a speech before it, but I don't know.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Would you say the inclusion of your name on the list of advisers was without your consent or authorization?

Miss KENYON. No. I wouldn't know. I wouldn't have any idea about it. This was in 1938, and I couldn't tell you about that. I have no recollection whatever. I should have thought that I had perhaps made a speech before the group.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And from that they put your name on the list?

Miss KENYON. They might very well have. I am inclined to think that they did in a number of cases.

I see Senator Capper here. I think I had some good company, and if it was Communist then, I certainly did not know it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I might suggest that on some of these lists you had some very bad company as well as good company.

Miss KENYON. You are quite correct. We know that now. We did not all know as much then.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am not reading any other names on the list. This is a matter that concerns you, Judge Kenyon.

Miss KENYON. Yes, I understand, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Films for Democracy was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report March 29, 1944, and as a Communist Front organization which merged with another front, Film Audiences, to become Film Audiences for Democracy. It was cited in the year



1939 by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, report of 1948, according to the information I have.

Miss KENYON. I also referred to that in my statement, saying that I had absolutely no record of it or memory of it. I take it from what you say that one was merged with the other.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I don't know. I am merely quoting from the report.

Miss KENYON. And the letterhead on which my name appears was dated, as you say, January 5, 1938?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. There is a date, January 5, 1938.

Miss KENYON. Yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Later, according to the information I have, it was merged with another organization to become an organization known as Film Audiences for Democracy, in 1939.

Miss KENYON. That I know nothing about.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have an alleged photostat of a letter of Film Audiences for Democracy, 342 Madison Avenue, New York. I do not have the date on this one, but on the advisory board, on the side of this letterhead, is the name of Dorothy Kenyon. That is the merged organization.

Miss KENYON. I know nothing whatever about it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I take it, then, that your name was put on there without your consent or approval.

Miss KENYON. I have no recollection, Senator, whether it was or not. I doubt that I ever had anything to do with it, but I cannot be sure. I have led a reasonably full life, and this was a long time ago.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Then you might have been a member of this?

Miss KENYON. It is possible I might have, but if I did I will repeat again that I had no ideas that it was Communist then, and I haven't any idea what it is now.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in their report of March 29, 1944, cited it as a Communist front. I have the citation book here if there is any question about the citation. And the California Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report in 1948, said "The Communist fronts, Film Audiences and Films for Democracy, merged in 1939 to form a new front, Film Audiences for Democracy."

I am told the New York City Council Committee Investigating the Municipal Civil Service Commission cited it as "an organization of Communist complexion."

Do you remember whether you canvassed the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom?

Miss KENYON. I think we discussed that previously, did we not? Yes, that's right. I have mentioned it, you have it, I mentioned it, and now you mention it again.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Were you a member of that organization?

Miss KENYON. I told you that I, in 1940, accepted membership in an ad hoc Citizens Committee to Promote Free Public Education. I have never heard of it since.

That is the one which had all of the college presidents on it, if you will recall.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. There was a meeting, I am told, according to this photostat which I have here and which I will hand you, sponsored, I believe, by that organization on April 13, 1940, and under the heading "These people sponsored this meeting" is the name of Dorothy Kenyon.

Miss KENYON. I have no recollection, but I may have.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You would not say that you did not? You would not positively state that you did not sponsor it?

Miss KENYON. That meeting?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That particular meeting.

Miss KENYON. I may have. It was, I believe, in that same year that I was accepting membership on this committee. It would not be inconsistent if I did. I repeat that I had no idea at that time that it was Communist. I saw Alvin Johnson's name there, and I am sure he did not think it was Communist either.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report for June 15, 1942, and also on March 29, 1944, as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers. The California Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report in 1948, says:

This Communist front was established on Lincoln's birthday in 1939. The activities of this group were always in behalf of communism. It has followed the Communist Party line as it switched and squirmed in support of the foreign policy of Soviet Russia.

It was cited as subversive and un-American by the Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations report, April 21, 1943.

I have a photostat, allegedly, of the letterhead of the Citizens' Committee to Aid Striking Seamen, 277 West Twenty-second Street, New York City, with a letter which is apparently a form letter photographed on this letterhead. On the side, under the heading "Advisory Committee", among others, appears the name of Dorothy Kenyon. This letter is dated January 28, 1937. Were you a member of that organization?

Miss KENYON. I have already reported on that. I could find absolutely nothing in my files, and I have absolutely no recollection. I have been sympathetic in a number of strikes, and it is perfectly possible that I may have sympathized with this. I know nothing about it whatsoever.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in December 1944, in a report in appendix IX, I believe—there is a typographical bobble here—cited it, as a Communist front.

Miss KENYON. At that time?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The report was made in December 1944. The date of the letter that I have is 1937.

Miss KENYON. I certainly did not know that it was Communist if it was Communist, nor am I sure that I was on it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I do not know whether you were or not, Judge. I merely showed you the photostat with the name "Dorothy Kenyon" on the side as a member of the advisory committee.

I have a photostat of a letterhead of the Conference on Pan American Democracy, with offices at 156 Fifth Avenue, New York. It

is dated November 16, 1938, and in the list of sponsors printed on the left-hand side of the letterhead is the name of Dorothy Kenyon.

Miss KENYON. I have covered that already in my statement.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Just to refresh my recollection, were you one of the sponsors of the organization?

Miss KENYON. Yes. I said that. I found the letterhead in my file dated March 4, 1939, and I remember making a speech before that organization, I think in 1938. On the letterhead was the name of Senator Paul H. Douglas, Quincy Howe, Stanley Isaacs, and Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, all good friends of mine. I didn't know the Communists on it, if there were some.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe it is alleged there were some on it.

Miss KENYON. I believe those gentlemen that I named were not Communists or even considered so by this committee.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Are you still a member of that organization?

Miss KENYON. I have never heard of it in 10 or more years.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did you ever withdraw from it?

Miss KENYON. According to this letterhead, I was a sponsor in 1939.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. 1938 is the date of this letter.

Miss KENYON. I'm sorry. The letter I have in my files is 1939. I'm sorry.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Then if this photostat is an accurate reproduction, you were a sponsor in 1938, and also according to your own letterhead in 1939?

Miss KENYON. That's right. I told you it was in my file, which brought me up a whole year longer than what you have.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. When was the last time you had any connection at all with this organization?

Miss KENYON. So far as I know, March 4, 1939. I have never heard of it since. I have difficulty remembering even this connection with it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Attorney General Tom Clark's letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948, cited it as subversive and Communist. It was cited as Communist front by the Special Committee on un-American Activities in its report March 29, 1944; also cited in the report of June 25, 1942.

The California Committee on un-American Activities, in its report, 1947, cited it as a Communist front, and it was cited as subversive and un-American by the Special Committee of the House Committee on Appropriations in its report of April 21, 1943.

Miss KENYON. I do not think I need repeat my position.

Senator TYDINGS. We want to go along, if you will permit us, to, for quite some time yet, but obviously there will be other members of the committee who will want to ask you some questions, and I am wondering whether it would be convenient for you to stay over tonight and come tomorrow to finish up.

Miss KENYON. Could we possibly finish tonight, Senator? I do earn my bread and butter practicing law, and I have had several days just knocked right out.

Senator TYDINGS. We will proceed, then.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe you discussed the New York League of Women Shoppers, and your association with that. I have

what is alleged to be a photostatic copy of their letterhead of January 25, 1940, in which you are listed, among others, as one of the sponsors. Is that correct?

Miss KENYON. No, that is absolutely not so, because I disagreed violently with them in about 1936 or 1937 and withdrew with a bang. I remember that very well indeed, so they probably just continued to carry my name on the letterhead, which I am sorry to say many organizations appear to have done.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did you withdraw in writing?

Miss KENYON. I think I probably did. I know I had a great row with them. I could find nothing in my files, but I don't keep files forever and ever.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. At about what time did you withdraw from that organization?

Miss KENYON. That was 1937, I think—maybe it was earlier than that. No, I think it was founded about 1935, and I think it was 1936 or 1937 when I withdrew as a sponsor. I was never a member.

I didn't approve of the way they handled things, and I told them so.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Then their use of your name on their letterhead as late as January 25, 1940, was completely without your consent and unauthorized?

Miss KENYON. That's right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. This organization was listed in 1944 by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-controlled front by indisputable documentary evidence obtained from the files of the Communist Party in Philadelphia, according to the citation, and it was cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1943 as one of the Communist-inspired and therefore Communist-dominated and controlled consumer organizations.

Miss KENYON. That was my understanding, too, and that is one of the reasons I withdrew from it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I merely wanted to get these things completely cleared up for the record.

I have a photostat of a letterhead of the Milk Consumers Protective Committee, 215 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York. The date of this is supposed to be April 23, 1940, according to the photostat, and under the heading "advisory board" is the name Dorothy Kenyon. Do you recall the Milk Consumers Protective Committee?

Miss KENYON. I covered that in my statement. I have absolutely no recollection of any such thing, and I can find absolutely nothing in my files.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. So that you cannot recall now whether or not you ever were a member of it, or a member of the advisory board?

Miss KENYON. That's right; that's right. It sounds so utterly foreign to me that I would say I could not possibly have been, but you do sometimes have a lapse of memory, especially about unimportant things.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think it is very apparent that a number of these organizations have been free with your name, Judge Kenyon. They have taken rather unusual liberties.

Miss KENYON. I think so too, Senator. It is unfortunate to be a liberal and a fighter for causes. It is probably better not to belong to anything.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you recall the organization called the Associated Blind, Inc.?

Miss KENYON. This is completely new.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Among the list of sponsors on this letterhead is "Honorable Dorothy Kenyon, Justice." I am merely asking you about the organization.

Miss KENYON. This, of course, is completely new, and I remember absolutely nothing about it. I don't know anything about it at all.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You have no recollection of the organization?

Miss KENYON. No. I would say I had never heard of it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Is that the fact, that you have never heard of it, so far as you remember?

Miss KENYON. That is right, yes. I haven't any recollection whatsoever of such a name.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Therefore the inclusion of your name as a sponsor of that organization would have been without your authority or consent?

Miss KENYON. I would say so; I would say so.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. This organization is cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in December 1944.

I have a photostat of an alleged program of the American Russian Institute, or I should say it appears to be an invitation to a dinner given by the American Russian Institute, a dinner and presentation of its first annual award to Franklin D. Roosevelt for outstanding service in furthering American-Soviet relations, given on Tuesday, May 7, 1946, at 6:30 o'clock in the grand ballroom of the Hotel Pennsylvania, in New York. On the list of sponsors—a partial list, it says—appears the name "Dorothy Kenyon." Do you recall that dinner of that organization?

Miss KENYON. I also covered that in my remarks. I do not recall the dinner, but I did say that, being a Rooseveltian, a devoted Rooseveltian, it might not have been strange if I had sponsored such a dinner in his honor.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The American Russian Institute for Cultural Relations With the Soviet Union was cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in its report in 1948.

Miss KENYON. Are you talking about the same organization, Senator, or is this another one?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It says "American Russian Institute for Cultural Relations With the Soviet Union." Perhaps I had better look it up in the citations.

Senator TYDINGS. While Senator Hickenlooper is looking that up, do some of these organizations have a parent body with branches in the various States, some of those that have been enumerated, like the Maryland Division or the California Division, or is there one organization that covers the country with a mantle? Do they have State chapters?

Miss KENYON. Of what?

Senator TYDINGS. Any of these organizations.

Miss KENYON. Do you mean, do I know?

Senator TYDINGS. Do you know?

Miss KENYON. No.

Senator TYDINGS. The reason I asked you is that there was put in evidence yesterday in one of the cases an exhibit where they had a Maryland chapter, and I was wondering whether or not they had chapters over the country in other States, because—and I don't say this is a fact, but I think it is a logical inference—one of the chapters might have a connotation that the parent body might not have, and vice versa, for that matter, so I think that when we go into the State findings on any of them we ought to know whether there are State chapters there. We don't know exactly what is being referred to.

Miss KENYON. Unfortunately I know so little about these organizations that have been mentioned that I am not the authority to tell you what their organization is.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Of course, the only reason these organizations are brought up is that your name appears on all of them as a sponsor or adviser or something of that kind, and I merely wanted to probe that situation a little.

Miss KENYON. That's right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think perhaps I should not press this for the moment, because this program says "The American Russian Institute cordially invites," et cetera, and the citation refers to the organization "American Russian Institute for Cultural Relations With the Soviet Union." That is the citation of its Communist activities. There is some addition to the name as contained in the program. It may not be the same, and I shall therefore pass it up.

The organization known as "Descendants of the American Revolution"—are you familiar with that?

Miss KENYON. Yes. That is not on this list. I have, however, a memory of that which is very clear, because that, again, was one of the organizations that I never would become a member of. I was associated with them at the start and I didn't like them, and I just dropped them as fast as I could.

The idea was a very nice idea, and I think it was Helen Hall, of New York, who told me that some Quaker lady whose name I forgot had thought up the idea of having some Descendants of the American Revolution who might have a slightly different program from that of the D. A. R. It sounded to me like an interesting idea. Dr. John Haynes Holmes, as I recall, was interested and was an adviser, and also, if I recall, Mary Simkhovitch, the very fine woman in New York who was for long the head of Greenwich House. We explored the idea, and I may have been on that advisory committee for a little while, but very soon I saw a little bit of some other people who were working in it and, as I say, I didn't like them at all and I got out as delicately but as fast as I could. That was all back in the early, or the middle of the 1930's, I would have said. I remember the idea intrigued me, but I did not like the people who were trying to put it into effect. They struggled to get me to join.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The photostat which I have lists "Dorothy Kenyon, prominent attorney" as a member of the advisory board.

Miss KENYON. As I say, I may have been on the advisory board for a year, along with John Haynes Holmes and Mary Simkhovitch, but I got out very fast. What is the date on that?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. There is no date that I notice.

Miss KENYON. It was the middle 1930's, I think. Oh, yes, they are both on there. Isn't that wonderful! My memory was good.

That idea did interest me.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And that was when, did you say?

Miss KENYON. It was around the middle 1930's, I would have said. I am not too clear about that. As I say, I haven't had a chance to look it up. I do have the recollection.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Your memory is good about that organization in the 1930's?

Miss KENYON. Yes, I remember that very much, because I was really interested in that idea. Most of these others I know nothing about because I had nothing to do with them.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The Descendants of the American Revolution are described by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of June 1942, as—

A Communist-front organization set up as a radical imitation of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The Descendants have uniformly adhered to the line of the Communist Party.

It was cited as a Communist front by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in its report in 1948; cited as "subversive and un-American" by the Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations in its report of April 21, 1943.

Miss KENYON. My feeling was sound. I might say that quite a number of my ancestors fought in the Revolutionary War—on the right side.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In the New York Journal-American of Sunday, March 12, 1950, under a story with a byline by Howard Rushmore, you are quoted—and I shall show you the entire story—

Miss KENYON. Yes; thank you very much.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. As saying, "Perhaps I was a sucker," when letterheads listed your name among the sponsors of Communist-front organizations dating from 1935 until 1949 and, "Denied in many instances that the use of her name had been authorized on stationery of organizations listed as Communist by Congress or the Attorney General," and, "Declared McCarthy was attempting to make people afraid of supporting popular ideas."

I wonder if that statement that "Perhaps I was a sucker" when letterheads listed her name among sponsors of the Communist organizations is an accurate statement.

Miss KENYON. I may have said that perhaps in certain instances I was a sucker, as who has not been, and I remember LaGuardia's statement that when he made a mistake, it was a "beaut," and I may have made one or two of those myself. When I have made a mistake, however, I think it has always been from generous motives, and never because of selfish political motivations.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you have a copy of this?

Miss KENYON. I have it right here. My counsel did not let me read it until this moment.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You are welcome to look at this, but if you have a copy of it we might as well keep this file together.

I have here a news story, Judge Kenyon, taken from the Times Record of Troy, N. Y., Tuesday evening, January 17, 1950, headed

"Hiss trial seen example of civil liberties hysteria"; subheading "Dorothy Kenyon, former judge, speaks at annual YWCA dinner." The story is as follows, and is under date of January 17, 1950:

The current perjury trial of Alger Hiss was cited last night by former New York City Municipal Court Judge Dorothy Kenyon as "a perfect example of a sacrifice to the hysteria created by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities." Speaking before a large gathering at a membership dinner at the Troy YWCA, Judge Kenyon claimed, "Lawyers agree that there is not one shred of respectable evidence to prove that Hiss did what he is charged with doing." She added that in spite of this, Mr. Hiss "will be lucky if he can get a hung jury in his second trial."

Now, for the purpose of my question, Judge, I do not intend to read any more of this. I expect to offer the entire story in evidence, and you may read it all if you want to, in evidence or anything else. But for the purpose of my question I will ask you, is that a substantially accurate statement of what you said in that speech?

Miss KENYON. There is one sentence in there which is not correct, where I am quoted as saying that lawyers agreed there was no evidence—did you say?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I shall read the quotation again, and I will be glad to hand you the story.

Miss KENYON. Thank you very much.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The quotation here is as follows:

Judge Kenyon claimed "lawyers agree there is not one shred of respectable evidence to prove that Hiss did what he is charged with doing." She added that in spite of this Mr. Hiss "will be lucky if he can get a hung jury in his second trial."

My question is as to the accuracy of the alleged quotation, which is alleged in the story to be a direct quote from your statement. I have no objection—in fact, it is perfectly all right with me if the whole story goes in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. Either way you want it.

Miss KENYON. It makes no difference to me, because I said everything except that one thing, as I recall it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It will be put in the record.

Miss KENYON. May I make a comment in respect to that?

Senator TYDINGS. You may.

Miss KENYON. I made the remark quoted in substantially those words, that it was a product of the hysteria created by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities. I was asked in the question period about the Hiss case, which many people have said too many things about already, and if I can very briefly summarize what I said about it, it was this: I did say that he would be lucky if he got a second hung jury. I also said, which is not here, that in the present condition of hysteria in the country it was almost impossible, it seemed to me, to find a jury who had not perhaps already gotten some preconceived idea of the issues, and therefore would be disqualified by having made up their minds in advance, and that I really thought it would be almost impossible to get what you would call a fair trial with a jury completely objective for at least 2 years in the present temper of the country.

In regard to this matter of evidence, what I said, in substance, was that there wasn't a shred of direct evidence except what Mr. Whittaker Chambers had said, plus the documents which also went back to Mr.



Chambers, because he had produced them. In fact, I think that is roughly what I said. There was some discussion of the whole subject on the part of the audience and myself. I think that there are a number of lawyers who agree with that position.

I do not know Mr. Hiss or Mr. Chambers or any of the parties involved.

Senator TYDINGS. The exhibit will be printed in the record.

[From Troy (N. Y.) Times Record, January 17, 1950]

HISS TRIAL SEEN EXAMPLE OF CIVIL LIBERTY HYSTERIA—DOROTHY KENYON,  
FORMER JUDGE, SPEAKS AT ANNUAL YWCA DINNER

The current perjury trial of Alger Hiss was cited last night by former New York City Municipal Court Judge Dorothy Kenyon as "a perfect example of a sacrifice to the hysteria created by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities."

Speaking before a large gathering at a membership dinner at the Troy YWCA, Judge Kenyon claimed "lawyers agree there is not one shred of respectable evidence to prove that Hiss did what he is charged with doing." She added that in spite of this Mr. Hiss "will be lucky if he can get a hung jury in his second trial."

The case of the former State Department official came up during Judge Kenyon's discussion on the status of civil liberties in the United States and in the world. She charged that "under J. Parnell Thomas (former Republican Representative from New Jersey) the House Un-American Activities Committee made accusations based on the flimsiest hearsay."

The loyalty tests of Federal employees, the Feinberg law, and wire tapping also came in for criticism from Judge Kenyon, a practicing attorney, who is now serving on the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women.

She declared that the Federal loyalty tests "contain no elements of a fair trial" and pointed out that the accused employees "do not even know the nature of the charges which are brought against them."

Characterizing the Feinberg law, which was recently declared unconstitutional, as an "invitation to tattle on teacher," Judge Kenyon called it a violation of academic freedom. She expressed the hope that the law "which is certain to be drawn up to replace it" (the Feinberg law) will be drafted with more caution.

Judge Kenyon told the gathering that "the people of the United States will soon be presented with a United Nations covenant on human rights which will include a mechanism for enforcement." She said that Americans must decide if they are willing to guarantee these rights and submit our violations of them to the World Court.

"The example the United States sets in the world will decide whether the democratic ideal will stand or fall," she asserted.

"If we are going to win the battle of ideas we have to put into practice our ideals of civil liberties," Judge Kenyon said, concluding with a plea for America to "get over the hysteria and end the witch hunting."

Judge Kenyon was introduced by Mrs. Margaret Spencer, Rabbi Julius K. Gutmann of the Third Street Temple led the devotional services, and Mrs. Norman R. Clarke, executive director of the Troy YWCA, gave the invocation.

The program was under the direction of Mrs. Sterling P. Olmsted of the public affairs committee.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Just as a matter of interest in your philosophy, which you have referred to in the past, Judge, I believe you graduated from what schools?

Miss KENYON. Smith College.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That was in 1908?

Miss KENYON. Yes, that's right; and New York University Law School. Harvard was not open then to women, otherwise I would have done what my brothers did.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you recall writing something for the Decennial Class Book of 1918?

Miss KENYON. 1918? I am afraid, Senator, you have the advantage of me. I haven't the faintest idea of what folly I may have committed at that point.

Senator TYDINGS. I don't think you would have been old enough to write in 1918.

Miss KENYON. Very sweet of you, but I was. I hope you did not mean mature.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am just wondering if you recall.

Miss KENYON. I don't recall one thing about it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Before I have even read it?

Miss KENYON. I don't recall one thing.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It is interesting. You might desire to check it. It goes to the question of your philosophy. I am told, in the Decennial Class Book of 1918, in writing about yourself, you used these words: "Absolutely not a Republican, nor a Prohibitionist. She can't altogether agree with the Democrats, nor can she quite commit herself to Socialists, toward whom perhaps she most inclines. Six years of nothing at all, of polite visits, existence and travel. How it reads like the days before the Russian Revolution. Here comes a change, and with about as little ceremony, enter the radical, the woman economically independent, the wage earner, the advocate of international democracy. Having once started on the downward path, nothing but disillusion is apparently likely to stop me."

Do you recall writing any such sentiments as that?

Miss KENYON. I don't even know what it means. Do you? I understand that part about Prohibition and Republicans, but nothing else.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I confess to some confusion, and I thought perhaps you might be able to explain it.

Miss KENYON. I am afraid I thought I was funny.

Thank you very much for calling it to my attention.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I thought sometimes those historical things are interesting to go back and review.

Miss KENYON. My class was also antisuffrage if I remember aright.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The question involved, so far as I am concerned—I assure you that I haven't the least evidence, nor do I have any belief, that you are subversive in any way.

Miss KENYON. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Or disloyal. I haven't approached that from that standpoint at all. Regardless of what other members of the committee may interpret as the statement Senator McCarthy made, I interpret the statement he made as suggesting that your membership or alleged membership in a great many organizations at least later or presently declared to be subversive is a matter for concern so far as the security risk goes in public service, especially in the State Department and its activities.

Senator McMAHON. Will the Senator yield at that point? I just wanted to quote from the record as to what the Senator did charge the witness with.

Miss KENYON. I have it here, and it was a little more than membership.

Senator McMAHON (reading):

I think it is important that the committee know that the Communist activities of Miss Kenyon are not only deep rooted but extend back through the years. Her

sponsorship of the doctrines and philosophy of this ruthless and godless organization is not new.

Miss KENYON. Thank you very much, Senator, and he also at one point, on page 168, said:

Here again we have this prominent State Department official, Judge Kenyon, crying aloud in her anguish for a fellow Red—

and he adds—

I call anyone who gets \$12,000 a year of the people's money very prominent— but of course I didn't get it—

a fellow red.

I consider that I have the right to assume that I was charged with being a Communist, and therefore disloyal, and I don't want to get angry. I have tried very hard not to.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I assure you that I am not taking the position that you are a Communist, so far as my views of the matter are concerned, but I would like to ask you whether or not you are familiar with Secretary Acheson's criteria on security risks as he has laid them down before committees of Congress and, I understand, published them.

Miss KENYON. No.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Are you familiar with that?

Miss KENYON. No, I don't believe I know them.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Assuming that he has laid down the criteria, among others, that membership in organizations that have been declared to be subversive by official bodies is a matter for serious question and examination of the person as a security risk before public employment is given them—I say assuming that; if I am incorrect in that statement I can be corrected—before you took public employment as a representative of this country on the United Nations, did any official discuss with you the allegations of your membership in organizations that had been declared to be subversive?

Miss KENYON. Never. They have come and talked to me about other people.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In the event, and this is a hypothetical situation, a supposition that I am making, the files in connection with information on your activities disclose, prior to the time of your employment or representation of this country, allegations of memberships in a substantial number of organizations that had been declared to be subversive by various public bodies, such as the Attorney General, the House Un-American Activities Committee, or other organizations of that sort, what is your personal opinion as to whether or not you should have been interviewed along that line?

I am assuming, for the purpose of this question, and making no allegation one way or the other, that there were repeated allegations in your file of membership in organizations that had been declared subversive. Do you think that you should have been talked to about this matter for some explanation or inquiry as to how your name happened to appear on these lists as sponsor and otherwise?

Miss KENYON. Well, Senator, I appreciate your asking me my opinion as to how the State Department should have handled this and other cases of dangerous persons. I would think, myself, in the first place, of the organizations that have been named here, membership in

them is practically not charged to me at all. I have been charged with sponsoring a number of organizations, some of which I am perfectly certain I never did sponsor. The ones that I think I did boiled down to a handful that were probably at the time I belonged not Communist at all, because I am sure you know about the infiltration of Communists into various organizations, and I would have thought that it would have been proper for the State Department, or any other governmental body, in considering taking someone on their staff, or whatever that they should look at their record in the round, and look at all their activities, and not just at a tiny little bit of a group, and I have recited a number of my activities here today. There are many others, during most of my life, which I have not troubled the committee with going into, because I did not want to take your time or bore you. I therefore simply hit the high spots of the things which were inconsistent with the so-called Communist line, and if you were to look into all my activities, I think you might think yourself, without further questioning of me, that I was a good security risk.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Judge Kenyon, the question I asked you—

Miss KENYON. I am sure I have been looked into by everything.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The question that I asked you—perhaps I didn't make it clear, and I merely asked for your opinion.

Miss KENYON. Yes; I understand.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In the light of the criteria laid down by the Secretary of State himself, in which he said that membership in organizations which had been declared to be subversive, or which were declared to be subversive by official bodies, was at least a cause for serious examination of the background and security risk potential of the individual who is considered for public office. In that light of those criteria, and then assuming for the sake of this question that in your files there appeared numerous cases where you were alleged to have been a sponsor or a member of a number of organizations, whether it is 20 or 25 or whatever number, but a substantial number—

Miss KENYON. It boils down nearer to six or eight.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am talking about the allegation. I am not talking about your actual membership. I am talking about the allegations that you were a member of a substantial number of these organizations. Wouldn't you think that in keeping with the criteria laid down for examination someone officially should have talked to you about this matter? Shouldn't it have raised some question? Shouldn't they have said, "We will go and see Judge Kenyon. We will give her an opportunity to tell us about these things."

Here are these allegations. Wouldn't you think that would be a perfectly normal thing in carrying out the investigating procedure before appointment as a public official?

Miss KENYON. It might have been done, Senator. I have no doubt that very serious consideration was given to my text, but what is gained by talking to a person and asking them whether they are subversive or are in favor of overthrowing the Government by force and violence, when you know perfectly well the answer that you will get does not seem to me very substantial? I think the things which they doubtless did do were to talk to people with whom I had been associated in various activities, and to get their views on me, which was

considerably more intelligent than to come and talk to me. What do you think I would have said?

Senator HICKENLOOPER, I would have said some of the things I have been saying to you today.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am minded to ask the question, Judge Kenyon—

Miss KENYON. It is the only way I can answer it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Because you so vigorously and so very properly and so quickly demanded to be heard in this case, when the charges were made by Senator McCarthy, and I would think that normally it would therefore be your reaction that of course the State Department should have come to you and let you present your case in this matter if these things appeared in the file. It would seem to me to be perfectly consistent.

Miss KENYON. I understand you now, Senator, and I would say this. You are now, instead of asking me whether I think this was something the State Department should have done, talking about it in terms of what I would have liked in respect to my own reputation.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am asking you for your judgment. You are a very able woman, a woman of experience; you are a jurist. Your opinion, I think, is valuable.

Miss KENYON. I would have been very happy had they come and had I been able to answer and to tell them that most of these things I had had nothing whatsoever to do with. I didn't know at the time that there was a case like this building up against me.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Don't you think it was a matter—

Miss KENYON. I have learned a lot lately.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That you might well have known about, that they should have talked to you about and told you about?

Miss KENYON. I would have liked it had they come to me; yes, indeed. I would have been delighted, and I would have given them another piece of my mind.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. With the reservation, Mr. Chairman, that I still feel and insist that, inasmuch as this is one of the cases involved in this matter, the investigative file must be available to this committee and that I don't consider this to be any kind of a complete questioning of the witness without the background of those files, I have nothing more to say at this time.

Senator TYDINGS. Judge, I would like to ask you one or two questions.

Have you ever been an employee of the State Department?

Miss KENYON. My answer would be that I don't think so. I am not sure what you call a United States delegate to the United Nations. I had always described myself as a piece worker—p-i-e-c-e worker—for the State Department. I do not think that that position is considered an employee. I am not sure, Senator. You are asking me a technical question. That is my only connection ever with the State Department.

Senator TYDINGS. The next question I would like to ask you is, What was your first notice of the charges that Senator McCarthy had brought here concerning you?

Miss KENYON. Wednesday.

Senator TYDINGS. In the newspapers?

Miss KENYON. At 12 o'clock a reporter called me up, and from then until 1 a. m. reporters called me up.

Senator TYDINGS. Did you have any notice that your name was going to be called into question before this committee before the reporter called you up?

Miss KENYON. I never had the faintest inkling. I was horribly busy. I had professional engagements all last week and this and next week; and tomorrow is income-tax day, and I do some income-tax work; and I was submerged with things and never once thought about Congress.

Senator TYDINGS. There has been no evidence here that anyone who has made any charge against you has actually seen the files in the State Department, so you, in answering these charges, are in the same position so far as the committee knows as was the witness who brought the original charges. They were brought, so far as we know, without any seeing of the State Department files themselves, and consequently you are here without us having seen the State Department files.

Miss KENYON. We are all in the same boat.

Senator TYDINGS. I would like to ask you this: When you joined any of these organizations, those that you have particularly identified yourself with and have given your reason for joining, how did you come to join them? Did you organize these things, or were you invited by someone you knew to join?

Miss KENYON. I was always invited. I have always been very busy with my law practice and then, of course, with my governmental work during those years of the thirties. Perhaps Government work isn't quite as trying as practicing law. I seem to have had a little more time in the late thirties when I was a Government official for extracurricular activities, and perhaps that is a pity. But in any event, you know, I got around, I spoke, and then I have always cared very much, as I stated, for the under dog; and the American Civil Liberties Union, of course, has dealt with under dogs; so people came to me and told me about projects.

Senator TYDINGS. What character of people suggested that you join any of these organizations?

Miss KENYON. Well, they were just people that I knew.

Senator TYDINGS. Were they prominent people in the community of well-known reputation, or were they people that were of shady reputation, or Communists, or pro-Communists, so far as you know, looking back on this record?

Miss KENYON. I would have said, for the most part, many of them were friends of mine who do have reputations, but I also know a lot of little people who don't have reputations in that sense of the word, and some of these little groups that have been talked about I surmise were perhaps in the beginning just a group of little people in some neighborhood in New York who had heard me speak and told me about their idea, and would I help them—maybe would I go on the advisory committee while they were trying to organize this thing, because I don't entirely deal in the world of Park Avenue and Wall Street.

Senator TYDINGS. I did not mean in the economic sense. I meant in the citizenship sense. Were any of these people who invited you to join, so far as you knew them, or so far as you know now, members

of the Communist Party, or allied with the Communist Party, or identified with Communist movements per se?

Miss KENYON. At the time when they came to me, I had no idea that they were Communists, if they were. I have had no idea whatsoever in respect to it. As I grew a little older in the thirties I worked out a policy that I was cooperative and friendly toward most people, but in respect to Communists, while I would support their civil liberties, my policy was isolationism, and I kept away from them and tried to keep them away from me.

Senator TYDINGS. I have lots of other questions, but I am going to defer to my two committeemen so you may not stay here if we can get through. Senator Green?

Senator GREEN. Miss Kenyon, you have many times in reply to a question referred to your filing system and having found nothing in your files. I think perhaps it would be just as well for you to say a few words as to what this filing system was. Was it your habit to open a file for a new organization you joined, and things like that?

Miss KENYON. Yes, Senator. I would be very glad to answer that question. It sounds a little formidable to call it a filing system; but, of course, you know I have my law office; and we, of course, have my legal files; and I have file clerks.

When it has come to the question of these nonlegal matters, but extracurricular activities, so to speak, my organizational matters, my various secretaries from time to time have tried to get order in them, and I have a file of associations. Where I have a great deal to do with them, the files with respect to them become very voluminous, and then I have miscellaneous association files. When there are specific things which become important enough to have a file by themselves, they get a file; and then, as I say, in the "miscellaneous" comes in what I would call the cats and dogs, the things that maybe I have just contact with for a very short period of time.

I did not, Senator, keep—unfortunately, if I did, I would have to pay much more rent than I do now—and I cannot keep all my files from the beginning of time, because every now and then we burst at the seams and I either have to throw out some old ones or buy some new filing cabinets or do both, and my office in New York is not a very big one. It is jammed with files. Every now and then we have to have a house cleaning, and out go a lot of little innocent lambs.

I had a file on this Political Bail Fund thing. We had a card for it. But it ended, you see, in 1934 or 1935, and there wasn't any file. We had thrown it out. So I was stuck. All I could do was to ask Roger Baldwin.

Senator GREEN. As a rule you have a file of one kind or other for any organization of which you are actively a member?

Miss KENYON. That's right, and we have cards for them.

Senator GREEN. And, when you say you haven't found any reference to it, you infer that in all probability it was just a passing interest or some minor activity like a speech or something of that kind?

Miss KENYON. That is precisely it. I also have a speech file, but it does not go back to the thirties.

Senator GREEN. My distinguished colleague asked you about a good many associations and organizations on which your name appeared

in some publication, such as an invitation to a dinner or something like that, and it was based on the theory of guilt by association.

Miss KENYON. Yes.

Senator GREEN. Because that is the only purpose it seems to me it could have, and he quoted the Secretary of State as referring to that as one of the criteria which might be used in determining an applicant or an employee's loyalty, although the Secretary of State used that only as one of a number—

Miss KENYON. A number of criteria?

Senator GREEN. Yes; that the thought should be applied.

I think it would be just as well, or I would be glad, at any rate, to hear your views on this theory of guilt by association. It always seemed to me as though that was one of the fundamental differences between the totalitarian and the democratic form of government.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, so long as the Senator has predicated his question on his assumption of what I said, may I clear it up?

Senator GREEN. I will be glad to have you do so.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I did not say the Secretary of State had set these up as criteria of loyalty. I used the term "security risk." There is a vast difference between security risk and either proof of or allegation of disloyalty. There is a vast difference between them. A bad security risk may be loyal intentionally.

Senator GREEN. I am glad the Senator understands the difference, because the resolution under which we are acting specifies disloyalty and not security risk, so I assumed that those who are charged in these hearings and before this committee were being charged with disloyalty. It seems to me it is a logical conclusion.

However, about this theory of guilt by association, I know you must have very definite ideas, and I will be glad to hear them.

Miss KENYON. Thank you, Senator. I want to be very brief.

Of course, guilt by association alone seems to me a violation of due process, which is in our Constitution as one of the civil liberties which I have fought for. The associations themselves, the organizations themselves—and I hold no brief for any of these; I am prepared to believe they are all devilish—nevertheless they themselves have never been found subversive by a court of law or by any process other than an administrative edict; and administrative edicts or fiats or whatever you call them sound to me like Mr. Hitler and Mr. Stalin; therefore, I think that the terming of an organization subversive is in itself a violation of civil liberty.

And then from that to jump to the fact that a person who is a sponsor or a member or participates in one tiny little project for a short period of time is therefore tarred with the same brush and is therefore himself or herself subversive seems to me a non-sequitur. Very frequently it just is not true.

Therefore it seems to me that due process is violated, and maybe it is a bill of attainder and maybe it is an ex post facto law. I am prepared to say that it is completely contradictory to the democratic process.

Senator GREEN. I thought that was your view, and I am glad to hear you state it so clearly.

Miss KENYON. I hope you read the New York Times editorial on "The Right To Join."



Senator GREEN. I did not. Perhaps this will be a good substitute. There is just one other question: You were furnished with a good many lists on which appeared disreputable people as well as people of the highest repute. I have before me a document relating to you which contains people I do not think any of whom are disreputable, all of the highest repute.

Miss KENYON. Oh, Senator, thank you.

Senator GREEN. And I think it would be well if it appeared in the record now. It is headed "For release upon completion of testimony by Judge Dorothy Kenyon before Subcommittee of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, March 14, 1950."

I don't know whether you care to read it and place it in the record. You are the only witness here; I suppose, unless you are overcome by modesty, you may do it.

Miss KENYON. Senator, you embarrass me. Might my counsel read it for me? If I know what it is, I would prefer not to read it myself.

Senator TYDINGS. Counsel will read the document.

Mr. KIENDL. The document reads as follows:

The following is a statement made public today by New York Attorney C. C. Burlingham and other prominent New York lawyers.

"The charges against Dorothy Kenyon made by Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin, in his testimony before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs are so fantastically false that here in New York where we all know Miss Kenyon they might well be ignored, but as the charges have been spread through the press of the entire Nation we who have known Miss Kenyon for years feel in duty-bound to declare and spread the truth as widely as possible.

"Miss Kenyon was admitted to the New York Bar in 1917. She is an able and experienced lawyer and served as justice of the municipal court by appointment of Mayor LaGuardia. She has served the city of New York with distinction in other official capacities and as a member of numerous boards and commissions of a public nature. She has attained a high reputation for her ability and her character. She is independent and liberal.

"We assert of our own knowledge that she has never had the slightest sympathy with communism in any of its forms. It is a matter of public record that long before World War II she warned of the loss of freedom in the totalitarian states. No citizen of New York is a more loyal American."

That is signed by: Ernest Angell, C. C. Burlingham, John W. Davis, Lloyd Garrison, Edward S. Greenbaum, Nicholas Kelley, William H. Davis, Newbold Morris, Robert Moses, Robert P. Patterson, A. J. G. Priest, Whitney North Seymour, and Ordway Tead.

Senator GREEN. Thank you.

Miss KENYON. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator TYDINGS. Senator McMahon?

Senator McMAHON. No questions.

Senator TYDINGS. Miss Kenyon, we are very much obliged to you for coming down here and testifying. We will try and not call you back unless you get in the headlines again.

Miss KENYON. Unless I get in hot water.

Senator TYDINGS. I would like to announce before we adjourn that I would like to have an executive committee meeting of the subcommittee in room G-23 in the Capitol tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock. I hope all members will be present. It is important that they all be there promptly so we can dispatch some pending business.

(Whereupon, at 5:15 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene upon the call of the Chair.)

has been cited by the Attorney General as a subversive organization is an indication that we failed, but if we are to be criticized it is perhaps because we are not active and aggressive enough to succeed, but at least we tried.

The Senator states that I was active in the launching of the American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts. That is true and I am proud of the fact.

He states that the American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts was cited as a Communist-front organization. That is less than a half truth. It was, in fact, cited by the Dies Committee on March 29, 1944, but not as a Communist-front organization. It was cited as "an organization with the same aims as the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, a Communist front advocating collective security prior to the signing of the Stalin-Hitler Pact" of 1939. The American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts did advocate collective security. So did the loyal members of the League of Nations. So do all the loyal members of the present United Nations. Those aims appear to have been shared by the American Congress for Peace and Democracy up to the time of the Stalin-Hitler Pact. No other aims were shared by that organization and the American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts. These aims were, of course, abandoned by the Communists, according to the party line, upon the announcement of the pact. They were not abandoned by the American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts; on the contrary they were intensified.

The Senator states that the leader of the American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts was the editor of the Daily Worker. This is entirely false. The editor of the Daily Worker was a member of the executive committee of the American Congress for Peace and Democracy. Neither he nor any other Communist played any part in the direction of the American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts. The chairman of the executive committee of the American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts was Dr. Clark M. Eichelberger, at that time president of the American Association for the League of Nations, and now president of the American Association for the United Nations. The 15 other members of the executive committee, including myself, were persons of known loyalty to the United States. There were no Communists in this group. The American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts was succeeded by the William Allen White Committee, also known as the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. The work of this committee in combating the Communist Party line is well known. I was one of the founders of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have answered Senator McCarthy's charges against me. If any of my answers is not entirely clear, I should be glad to supplement them to the best of my ability. I would like to present a group of letters which I have been requested to deliver to the chairman. I offer also a list of my publications.

Senator TYDINGS. Is it your wish to put them in now? The list of publications will be exhibit 55.

Mrs. BRUNAUER. I should like to put them in now.

There is a list of the letters. I do not think it is necessary to read the whole list, if that is all right with the committee.

Senator TYDINGS. You do want the letters in the record?

Mrs. BRUNAUER. Yes. There is an additional letter also received.

Senator McMAHON. I would like to know who they are from.

Mrs. BRUNAUER. These are the names of persons who addressed letters to the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations and that are being presented to the subcommittee by me today:

- Milton S. Eisenhower, president, Kansas State College;  
 Senator Joseph H. Ball, Washington, D. C.;  
 Ralph H. Lutz, president, Stanford University and president of the American Association of University Professors;  
 Mrs. Vera B. Whitehome, New York, N. Y.;  
 Miss Margaret S. Morris, dean, Pembroke College in Brown University;  
 Katherine K. Rice, a physician in Washington, D. C.;  
 Sarah Gibson Blanding, president, Vassar College;  
 Dr. Gertrude Kornfeld, Rochester, N. Y.;  
 James P. Hendrick, Washington, D. C.;  
 Mrs. Helen Alley, Arlington, Va.;  
 Mrs. Ruth Lyons, Washington, D. C., director, Statistics Branch, Public Housing Administration;  
 Ben M. Cherrington, director, University of Denver;  
 Howard E. Wilson, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, N. Y.;  
 Herbert Emmerich, director, Public Administration Clearing House, Washington, D. C.;  
 Mrs. Olive Clapper, Washington, D. C.;  
 Richard P. McKeon, department of philosophy, University of Chicago;  
 Blanche N. Dow, president, Cottey College, Nevada, Mo.;  
 Eliot B. Coulter, Assistant chief, Visa Division, Department of State;  
 George F. Zook, president, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.;  
 Louise Leonard Wright, The Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, Ill.;  
 Graham H. Stuart, department of political science, Stanford University;  
 Dr. Margaret Mary Nicholson, Washington, D. C., our family pediatrician;  
 Hugh Moore, chairman of the board, Dixie Cup Co.;  
 Mrs. Marjory B. Loengard, New York, N. Y.;  
 Malvina Lindsay, the Washington Post, Washington, D. C.;  
 Mrs. Helen K. Knandel, educational consultant, traffic engineering and safety department, American Automobile Association, Washington, D. C.;  
 Mrs. Anne H. Johnstone, director, League of Women Voters of the United States, Washington, D. C.;  
 Ralph E. Himstead, general secretary, American Association of University Professors, Washington, D. C.;  
 Herman Hertzberg, a personal physician;  
 Mrs. Gladys Murphy Graham, Santa Monica, Calif.;  
 Miss Dorothy Fosdick, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State;  
 C. Mildred Thompson, emeritus dean and professor of history, Vassar;  
 Eleanor Lansing Dulles, Department of State;

Mrs. Ruth S. Brumbaugh, president, Washington branch, American Association of University Women;

A. J. Brumbaugh, Washington, D. C.

I wish to add, Mr. Chairman, that these letters are presented to you as letters from people who have known me well and worked with me. They are not letters presented in order to impress the committee with what an important person I may or may not be, but people who can tell you about my character through the years.

May I also add Mrs. Eire Stevens?

Senator TYDINGS. The letters will be put in the record to supplement the names which have been read, as a group numbered exhibit 56.

Mrs. BRUNAUER. Thank you, sir.

Senator TYDINGS. Will you give the letters to the reporter before you leave, so that they may go in the record?

Mrs. BRUNAUER. Yes. Then I have one more, Mr. Chairman, from Judge Marion J. Harron, who has known me since I was in high school.

May I also read a personal letter from Mr. Milton Eisenhower? He said:

DEAR ESTHER: I am happy you wrote me, because I have been so angry about the McCarthy charges that I have been wanting to take some kind of action. You give me the very opportunity I need. The first letter I wrote for you just smoked with adjectives. Then I decided you didn't want that kind of testimonial, so I send you the attached very calm letter. If it isn't exactly what you want, please let me know at once.

I will see you in April at the commission meeting.

Senator TYDINGS. Dr. Brunauer, is he the president of Kansas or Penn State College?

Mrs. BRUNAUER. He is the president of Kansas and will assume his duties as president of Penn State very soon—July 1, I believe.

May I proceed?

Senator TYDINGS. You may proceed.

Mrs. BRUNAUER. It is possible that a very brief summary of the high points in my career may save time in the end.

I was born and brought up in the State of California. I received my Ph. D. at Stanford University in 1927 in history and political science. My principal interest since my graduation has been in international relations. My first job was in that field. It lasted 17 years. It was with the American Association of University Women. I have been in the Department of State ever since.

One of my most important projects for the American Association of University Women may be considered to deserve special mention. This was a study of national defense in relation to foreign policy which was undertaken by the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War under a commission of which I was chairman. The report, entitled "National Defense, Institutions, Concepts, Policies" was published in 1937 by the Women's Press of the YWCA. After that, the commission reported annually on the problems of the National Defense Establishment which were important in the ever more critical international situation. Admiral Standley, who was then Chief of Naval Operations, has stated to me that he considers that this study was largely responsible for converting various pacifistic organizations in this country and thus making possible an immediate program of rearmament.

In this regard, I think the committee will also be interested in the part that I played in the international activities of the American Association of University Women during the critical period of 1939-41, the period of the Stalin-Hitler friendship pact. These activities culminated in the resolution of May 8, 1941, adopted by the biennial convention of the association in which they voted for--

Recognition of a common cause with all nations resisting totalitarian aggression and furnishing of whatever aid we can give to make this resistance effective.

This was in direct opposition to the Communist line at that time. Of course, I don't want the committee to believe that I did all this single-handed. I was a staff member, but it was a development of opinion in which I participated and of which I am proud.

Between 1941 and the beginning of 1946 there is nothing of particular interest to this committee in my career except my work with Mr. Bloom at San Francisco in 1945. In February 1946, I was designated representative of the United States on the Preparatory Commission for UNESCO. In my work with UNESCO I have attended sessions of the General Conferences at Paris, Mexico City, and Beirut. Those who have worked with me could tell you that I have been diligent in devising ways to thwart the attempts of Communists to use UNESCO for their own purposes.

Mr. Milton Eisenhower, president of Kansas State College, was at those conferences as a delegate. He has asked me to deliver a letter to you, Mr. Chairman, in which he is kind enough to make the following statement regarding my work. Now I am quoting from Mr. Eisenhower's letter:

I would say that the present ideological warfare in the world is Dr. Brunauer's chief concern, and in this she is constantly working to uphold United States policy, as well as the democratic philosophy generally, and to defeat the devious and clever tactics of the Russians and their satellites. At the Mexico City conference in 1947, for example, she spent a full month in counteracting the efforts of a Russian-dominated Polish delegation to pin the tag of "warmonger" on the Western democracies, and especially on the United States. She worked with devotion, precision, and effect. She was completely sincere in all she did.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer briefly to the charges made by Senator McCarthy against my husband, Dr. Stephen Brunauer. As to my husband's past, his Communist connections existed a very long time ago, more than 20 years ago, in fact. He came to this country at the age of 18 as an immigrant. He was without friends, without money, and without a command of the language. He was eager for American companionship, but this was largely denied him. His need for friends and companions was filled, in his first years here, by a group of young people of similar national origin who spoke the same language, and these people unfortunately were largely Communists. They brought him into the Hungarian section of the Young Workers League. After about 3 years, he began to understand the operations of the Communist movement more clearly and to see more clearly its conflict with American institutions. He dropped out of the Young Workers League early in 1927, and has not been a member of any Communist group since that time. His association with individuals in the Communist movement diminished rapidly after he came to Washington in 1928. By 1932 he had been denounced by the Communists as a deserter from their cause.

I shall not insist, one way or another, but I would like to ask about some names.

Do you know of a man, officially—Albert Rhys Williams?

Mr. BUDENZ. I do. I am surprised that you asked me, but I know him.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you know anything about whether he is a Communist or not?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes, he is a Communist of long standing.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you know that personally, or by official report?

Mr. BUDENZ. I have known him for many years. Of course I have not seen him recently, but I have known him for years; even before I was in the Communist Party, I knew he was one.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. So, you know he is a Communist.

Mr. BUDENZ. Right.

Senator McMAHON. Who is that?

Mr. BUDENZ. Albert Rhys Williams.

Senator McMAHON. What does he do?

Mr. BUDENZ. I think he was a former minister, or educator for the—I am not quite sure, something along that line, and then he became a Soviet propagandist. He has written. He always claimed to be a liberal and not a Communist, but I know him to be a Communist. He was a great friend of Robert W. Dunn.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you know anything about Donald Hiss? Would you like to comment on that?

Mr. BUDENZ. I would not like to comment on that.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That means that you would not like to comment at this time on it.

Mr. BUDENZ. That is correct.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now, these three names, would you like to comment on whatever personal knowledge, official knowledge, you may have on John Davies, of the State Department?

Mr. BUDENZ. I know nothing about him.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I see.

Senator McMahon mentioned three names, three other names. I mention here Ruby Parsons and John Carter Vincent, who is now Minister to Switzerland.

Mr. BUDENZ. I would prefer not to discuss those at the moment, until I can file the list with the committee. That will permit—I feel this is quite a responsible obligation—without being more careful in my statements.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I shall not press—

Mr. BUDENZ. I will say, in reference to Albert Rhys Williams, I don't know what he is today, whether he is a Communist or not. I know he was a Communist up to the last minute I heard of him.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Are you familiar with Henry Wallace's book that he wrote and published in 1946 about his trip to Siberia, and up in there?

Mr. BUDENZ. I have read his book, but I could not discuss it at the moment. I would have to read it over.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Then, you have no comment at the moment as to whether the Communists consider that to be a Communist—

Mr. BUDENZ. That was what you might call—Wallace was just surrounded by Communist influence there, in the writing of that book, and also, his policies—

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Are you aware of the fact that Henry Wallace, in writing that book, gives credit to Owen Lattimore and to John Rhys Williams as his—

Mr. BUDENZ. Albert Rhys Williams.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Albert Rhys Williams as his collaborators in the writing of that book?

Mr. BUDENZ. I am aware of that.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, if you are anxious to leave—

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead, I will remain.

Mr. BUDENZ. While the Senators wait, I don't know whether this is an impertinent observation or not, but would it be agreeable if I were to furnish anything I know, outside of Mr. Lattimore, what I could on the Amerasia case to Mr. Morgan?

Senator TYDINGS. It would, and let me say this to you, Mr. Budenz: Obviously, as you already know, this is primarily directed to the State Department employees, past and present.

Mr. BUDENZ. I understand.

Senator TYDINGS. Anything that touches on that would be pertinent. If it does not touch on that, so far as I am concerned, I would like for you to turn it over to the F. B. I., because we do not have the facilities to go into things outside of the scope of our investigation.

Mr. BUDENZ. Very well.

Senator GREEN. On this list, some of those who are on that list were in no departments—

Senator TYDINGS. If you will wait—

Mr. BUDENZ. People I would know of, in Government departments.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. May I complete my record?

Mr. Budenz, I have here a copy of a magazine that is called The Reporter of April 25, 1950. It has pictures of people who have left the Communist Party. Your picture is up here, and there is a man there alleged to be Arthur Koestler; also the name and picture of a man alleged to be Stephen Spender; the name and picture of Ignazio Silone; also, a woman named Ruth Fischer—

Mr. BUDENZ. That is Eisler's sister—Gerhart's.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Also a man Traicho Kostov; also a man named Granville Hicks; also a man Wladyslaw Gomulka; and a man by the name of Laszlo Rajik.

Do you know all those people?

Mr. BUDENZ. I don't know some of them—I don't know all.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I will show you the pictures. The only thing that I was going to ask you—

Mr. BUDENZ. The only one I know personally, of those, are Ruth Fischer, whom I met after she left the Party, and Granville Hicks. I don't know anyone else.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you have any reason to believe, any sound reason to believe, that any of those people may not have been sincere in leaving the party, or that they may be back, actually, in the party, but openly—

Mr. BUDENZ. Oh, no. The point of the matter is that the people that leave the party and attack it in this wise, openly, are anti-Communists. You can count on that. The party will take care of that, and the person who is suspect, however, when they leave the party, are the ones who remain silent and quiet in regard to the party.

I understand. See what I mean, Senator?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. BUDENZ. That is not due to the fact that they leave the party to become agents of some kind, but after they leave, you see this thing I talked about, about being bribed, about being intimidated or something like that—now, the ex-Communist, such as Silone, Koestler, Ruth Fischer, and myself, as far as we are concerned, are hated more by the Communist Party than anything else. Their press is full of vituperation of us and use every opportunity for injury. They use every device and that is the reason you have to be so cautious, but an ex-Communist who remains silent is a problem.

I will give you an example.

Off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

Senator GREEN. Mr. Budenz, just as you have told us already, there are certain people in the party who make believe they are non-Communists, so are there not people that are outside that make believe they are Communists?

Mr. BUDENZ. No; no.

You see, those people—look, Senator—those people who would do a thing like that, especially if they were to go and attack the party, month after month, and in trial at the trial—

Senator GREEN. That seems rather absurd.

Mr. BUDENZ. That doesn't happen. That is to say, a man like Koestler, for example—

Senator GREEN. But, there are certain people in the party that make believe they are not; that is true?

Mr. BUDENZ. Surely. That is different. That is to deceive the outside; but, you would have utter confusion within the Communist army, if you try the other thing. In addition, see, one thing, Senator, that they do, they are always watching for agents of the Government.

Senator GREEN. That would be one way to put people off, make believe you are opposed to a thing when you are in favor of it?

Mr. BUDENZ. You would not say you are a Communist, I am sure, and—

Senator GREEN. You don't know of any such case?

Mr. BUDENZ. No; no. That is unheard of, because that would create utter confusion and would destroy the party, itself, eventually.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have nothing else.

Senator GREEN. You have not told us, it would be very illuminating, in view of all you have told us, if you told us why you originally joined the party.

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, I would be glad to tell you that, Senator, and why I left. Of course it is a long story, and linked up with my religion. Briefly, it is a sort of personal story.

Senator GREEN. It must be an interesting story.

Mr. BUDENZ. The thing is, I was a great labor—I don't mean "great," I mean intense, and intent labor worker when I was young, and was also very strongly opposed to discrimination against the Negro people



and a number of other things, and thought these reforms were not being cured fast enough. In fact, I took a trip out to Leeds, S. Dak., to help the fight of Bishop Bush, a Catholic. The bishop was against a 7-day week. That was a long time ago. I was about 18 or 19 years old, and I thought he didn't get proper support. I got angry, and in addition—that is what helps to make Communists, thoughtlessness, and impatience, and I felt that he wasn't getting the proper support and that made me criticize the Catholic Church of which I was a member. I left the church.

I did not become a Communist; I went on fighting for labor. I organized strikes. The fact is that I was arrested 21 times in the injunctions, the old days when that injunction was such a problem. I used to get sent in for the A. F. of L. union. Time went on, and I got more and more impatient, thinking that things were not remedied, and I became a Communist.

Senator GREEN. Did you become a Communist at once, or gradually?

Mr. BUDENZ. I fought the Communists; I opposed them. I opposed them very strongly when I was working for the A. F. of L.; and then I gradually, especially in 1935, came around to a certain extent. I will say this, though; I don't want to make it public, because it just looks like an excuse, but to a certain extent I was taken in. That is, that although I knew that Stalin ruled the organization, when they said in 1935, at the People's Front Congress, that they were going to cooperate with a democratic organization and democratic nations, I thought then that communism was becoming democratic on its part, and that it would merge, you understand, into a democratic Communist development.

Therefore, after People's Front Congress was when I joined, after 1935; but of course I soon found, when I joined the Communist Party, right up on the ninth floor here was Eisler.

Senator GREEN. In New York, you joined them?

Mr. BUDENZ. That is right. I became part of the Daily Worker, right away, because they knew me.

Senator GREEN. What do they do or what did they do to test you, to be sure you could stick it out, and that you'd be loyal to them?

Mr. BUDENZ. First of all, they knew me, or had known of me for a number of years in a neighborhood movement; knew my views on how I was opposed to them, and then worked with them in the united front, and so forth; and, secondly, they wanted to use me, as they frankly told me later, because at that time they were trying to weave into the CIO union, and I had been on friendly terms with many of the men who helped form the CIO, like Tom Kennedy of the Miners and, well, John Brophy, and a number of those men who knew me from years back. So, they used me in a sort of front. Jack Stachel told me that. That is why they put me on the central committee so fast.

However, I found Eisler on the top floor, and Peters; and there was Feruccio Marini, whose real name was Fred Brown—they were running the party. Browder was a stuffed shirt, just a front. That is the rule of the Kremlin. The man running the party in every country is never from that country. An American can run the Philippine or Chinese Party.

Senator GREEN. When you are initiated or whatever you call it, you have to take an oath?

Senator TYDINGS. Counsel will have to decide that.

Mr. MORGAN. "Will you detail for us to the best of your recollection all sums received from Chinese sources, including the payment of your passage and expenses when you came to the United States in 1939?"

Miss UTLEY. I am sorry, but I had no money passage paid me when I came in 1939. Nothing was paid to me by the Chinese.

Mr. MORGAN. "Are you now, or have you ever been, a member or director of the China Policy Association?"

Miss UTLEY. I am a member of the China Policy Association. There is no income in it.

Mr. MORGAN. "You are a member as distinguished from being a director, or are you both?"

Miss UTLEY. When I lived in New York I was, I think it is called, a director. That is, I regularly went to the meetings. Since I have lived in Washington I go very occasionally. I haven't been to a meeting for a long time.

Mr. MORGAN. "Describe in detail the purpose and objectives of this association, its members, officers, and directors."

Miss UTLEY. Really, I think you had better ask Mr. Kohlberg. I can't answer that. It is a group of us who were interested in China, who were anti-Communist. The membership of the board of directors ranges from right to left, up and down. It includes Mr. Peabody of the New Leader; Mr. Kohlberg; Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce; Irene Kuhn, formerly of NBC although I don't know whether she is there any more. You had better ask Mr. Kohlberg.

Mr. MORGAN. "Is Mr. Kohlberg the head of the association?"

Miss UTLEY. Yes. As I say, I haven't attended a meeting in a long time.

Mr. MORGAN. The Chairman suggests that I ask, what are the objectives of the association.

Miss UTLEY. The main objective—I don't think I can answer for them, but as far as I understood it, they were a group of people interested in China who were anti-Communist and wanted to do something to counteract the influence of all these pro-Communists in the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Perhaps you have answered this question: "Have you received any compensation for your participation in the China Policy Association?"

Miss UTLEY. No. I don't go to their meetings largely because I can't afford to go to New York just for a meeting of the China Policy Association.

Mr. MORGAN. "Did you write, in 1940, The Dream We Lost?"

Miss UTLEY. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. "In that book did you advocate a negotiated peace with the Nazis?"

Miss UTLEY. Yes. That is not quite correct. I advocated a negotiated peace with Germany in order to prevent Russia dominating Europe, and I also argued—if you want the book, anybody can look at it. I argued that we could hope to have the Nazis overthrown from within, but that if the war went on to a point that Russia was able to dominate Europe, communism would be even worse than nazism.

Senator TYDINGS. Can I ask, is it possible to get a copy of the book?

Miss UTLEY. In the Congressional Library. It is out of print.

Senator TYDINGS. Have you an extra copy that we can use for reference if I were to return it to you?

Miss UTLEY. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. "Will you give us an explanation of the quotation appearing on page 361 of that book, which reads as follows: 'If Germany can be halted upon its mad course of conquest, but not destroyed, and the genius of the German people allowed to play the leading role in the reconstruction and unification of Europe, National Socialism may be humanized and democratized.'"

Miss UTLEY. I think, Mr. Morgan, I refer you much better to my book published last year, *The High Cost of Vengeance*, in which I go into all detail in all this. My own view of Germany was that Germany had followed the false star of the Nazis owing to economic conditions and despair, and the great difference I made in that book between Communist Russia and Nazi Germany was that in Communist Russia an alternative to the Communists had been wiped out, whereas in Germany, because of murder by the Nazis of all nonparty members had never gone to anything like the extreme in Russia, in Germany my book was—you take me far outside the purpose of this committee—mainly an argument to show that Communist Russia was even worse than Nazi Germany. It was written in 1940, when most people had been led to believe that Communist Russia was wonderful and that the only criminal, the only bad, government in the world was Nazi Germany.

Mr. MORGAN. "Did you in 1941 write an article in *Common Sense*, reprinted in the *Reader's Digest* in October 1941, which stated: 'There are times when there is only a choice of evils, and today the evil of accepting the fact of Nazi domination of continental Europe is less than the evil which is likely to result from encouraging England to continue indefinitely a hopeless fight until English liberties also are destroyed, either from within or without?'"

Miss UTLEY. I did not bring the book; I brought this along. I would like you to take the whole article in the record if you take part of it.

My point was that America was not in the war then, and I think the whole point again is that I felt it was a choice of evils. I rather like that quotation, because that is just what I was trying to prove. I considered it was a choice of evils.

Mr. MORGAN. I am sure the entire article ought to be in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. I think the entire article ought to be in so there won't be any false interpretation drawn from it, but as I read the quote here, is that a correct quotation?

The evil of accepting the fact of Nazi domination of continental Europe is less than the evil which is likely to result from encouraging England to continue indefinitely a hopeless fight until English liberties also are destroyed, either from within or without.

Is that a correct quotation?

Miss UTLEY. That is from the original. *Reader's Digest* picked it up and altered it again. I can't tell you whether that is exact.

Mr. MORGAN (continuing the questions). "Do not these quotations, as well as others of your writings, establish that prior to Pearl Harbor you were writing sympathetically for the Nazi cause?"

Miss UTLEY. No; they do not.

Mr. MORGAN. Again in *Solution in Asia*, page 142, you say [reading]:

Outer Mongolia may be called a satellite of Russia in the good sense.

Would you care to elaborate on that?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes. "In the good sense." I will see what I have about it here. If I have it in print, there is no need to repeat it.

It is in the good sense, to the best of my knowledge, of Outer Mongolia, in that the satellite relationship between Outer Mongolia and Russia is not due to a Russian conquest; it is due to the free association. Those people never had any free institutions; but, as far as the association can be free in a society like that of the Mongols, it was a free association of Outer Mongolia with Russia, and it resulted not from the Mongols' thinking that the Russians were wonderful. "Let's tag after them"; but, as I have explained—I am not sure whether it is in this book, but elsewhere; I have frequently written on the subject—the Mongols had had such a raw deal from the Chinese, and were so badly scared by the presence of the Japanese in Manchuria, that not as a choice of the best, but as a choice of the less bad, they preferred to associate with Russia.

Mr. MORGAN. Perhaps you have also touched on the next statement that I want to refer to. Page 144 of the same book, in which you say [reading]:

Soviet policy in Outer Mongolia cannot be fairly called Red imperialism.

Does the observation you have just made apply also to that statement?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That applies in exactly the same way.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, here is a statement, Dr. Lattimore, that I want to bring to your attention, in the light of an observation made a moment ago about this so-called guilt by association. On page 190 of your book, *Solution in Asia*, you say [reading]:

In the first interim government we should include political and parliamentary leaders still surviving who have a record of imprisonment or of being beaten up by political gangsters, or threatened with assassination. To protect them from terror we should include among war criminals all officers and civilians with proved associations of the Black Dragon type, who should be punished according to their guilt, with deportation and internment as the minimum.

There, I notice, you suggest that association with organizations such as the Black Dragon, on the part of Japanese, should be a basis for sanctions.

Would you care to comment on that in the light of your statement with respect to and regarding guilt by association?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I think that is a case, Mr. Morgan, of—what is the popular word now—"semantics"—and I think that the word "association" is used in this text here very differently from the use with which we are familiar when we speak of guilt by association in this country.

When I said proved associations, organizations like the Black Dragon, I meant proved participation in the activities of the Black Dragon Society, which was a terroristic society.

At that time I don't think this phrase "association" had acquired quite the flavor that it now has.

Mr. MORGAN. Going on, Dr. Lattimore—and, believe me, this is as hard on me as it is on you—in Solution in Asia, page 191 [reading]:

When Japan begins to show an ability to make progress politically, we must expect the leadership to be left of center and at least liberal enough to be friendly with Russia.

What do you mean by “liberal enough to be friendly with Russia”? Is it possible to be “liberal enough and friendly with Russia” without going all the way?

Dr. LATTIMORE. In 1945, Mr. Morgan, it certainly was. It happened all over the place.

Mr. MORGAN. Do you still feel that way about it, Dr. Lattimore?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Not so easy now.

Mr. MORGAN. Has your opinion changed, Dr. Lattimore?

Dr. LATTIMORE. My opinion has changed. The whole climate of international relations has deteriorated since 1945.

Mr. MORGAN. That brings us to another statement in Solution in Asia, page 199, in which you say [reading]:

The difficulty in dealing with Russia is not Russian policy, but the truly appalling lack of an American policy.

Do you still feel that way about it?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I feel that in 1945 we did have a lack of policy about what to do in China, Korea, Japan, that seemed to me appalling, and I think the results since then have shown that we were badly prepared in Asia for the situation that arose after 1945, and despite the outstandingly good work done by MacArthur in the occupation of Japan, by General Marshall in trying to salvage the situation in China, nevertheless, we did get into a mess.

Mr. MORGAN. With respect to the situation today, do you feel that our unpleasantness with the Soviet Union is the result of Russian policy, or of any policy that this country is now or has been projecting?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I think it is mainly due to the Russians themselves. I think, however, that it is also partly due to lack of policy or lateness of action, on our part. We have been a part of a steadily deteriorating situation which has produced a worse and worse atmosphere on both sides and has made it more and more difficult on both sides to get out of the kind of grouping of attitudes that we are in.

Mr. MORGAN. Dr. Lattimore—

Dr. LATTIMORE. I might elaborate on that point a little bit, though, because it is a part of a whole attitude of interpretation of modern international relations that I began to develop at this time in Solution in Asia and have developed further since, and that is that a great part of the deterioration of the international situation stems primarily not from Russian expansionism, and certainly not from what the Russians call American imperialism, it stems rather from the fact that the combined effect of the war in Europe and in Asia was a very serious weakening of what hitherto had been great powers, like England and France, and the weakening of these powers which had formerly held a strong position in Europe, and also a strong position in Asia, created a weakness in the general international structure, to deal with which inevitably both Russia and the United States took steps, but since these steps were not taken according to prior agreements they inevitably led to rivalry; but the cause lies primarily

in the weakening of what has been the great power structure of the world before the Second World War.

Mr. MORGAN. I believe you testified, Dr. Lattimore, that nowhere in your writings did you feel that you had ever referred to Chinese communism as merely agrarian radicalism, and I must say that while I have read rather exhaustively, I think, from your writings, I will say at this point that it has not been as easy to follow your writings as it was your statement.

I have found in the Virginia Quarterly Review of 1940, pages 164 and 165, a statement that I would like to have you comment on:

The question of China illustrates perfectly how we think about China with two quite different parts of our brain. On the one hand we take it for granted that there is practically no industrial proletariat in China, that the heavily agrarian structure in China makes it necessary for even the Chinese Communists to be agrarian radicals rather than true Communists, and that the Chinese family system is notably resistant to Marxist ideas. On the other hand we also take it for granted that the Chinese are incapable of looking after themselves and all it needs is a little excitement to turn them into raging Reds. What is more, the persons associated with the second set of ideas are usually potent enough to stampede the intelligence of those associated with the first set.

Now, this is a long way around the mulberry bush, but if I read this correctly the first set of ideas, which interpreted the Chinese Communists to be agrarian radicals, are the ideas to which you attach the intelligence associated with such thoughts.

Would you comment on that statement?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I haven't a text of that statement. Are you sure the first sentence does not apply to the lack of industrial proletariat? Yes; the question of intelligence, Mr. Morgan, refers to a group of ideas, that there is, perhaps, no industrial proletariat, that structure of society is heavily agrarian, that this structure makes it necessary for them to be agrarian radicals—in quotes. That was the current phrase at the time. It was not my phrase. That is why I used it in quotes. This question of true communism.

I don't remember whether later in that article I clarified these questions that are in quotes, but I should like to quote to you a recent—not so very recent—letter that I wrote in response to a private inquiry on the subject.

Somebody wrote to me, in 1948, and asked for my opinion on the subject, and I, on January 21, 1948, I wrote back [reading]:

The Chinese Communists are involved in a very wide movement of the Chinese people which in some ways is extremely complicated but in others is quite simple. The Chinese Communists themselves make no bones about the fact that they are complete and convinced Marxists. They do not pretend that they are simple agrarian radicals. On the other hand, the Chinese Communists who are Communists are vastly outnumbered by their allies who include all kinds of liberals, nationalists and democratically inclined people. As so often happens in human affairs, the majority of these people are fighting with the Communists, as though on the side of Communists, not because they are for communism but because they are more against the homeless Chinese Government than they are against communism.

Now, in 1940 the situation was the same. As I say, I speak without knowing whether in the full article I dealt with this other aspect of the matter or not. But the fact is that in 1940 the Chinese Communists were gaining ground politically by offering to meet the agrarian needs of an agrarian society.

That does not mean that they were converting themselves from Marxists to agrarians. It means that they were exploiting the condition that then existed.

Mr. MORGAN. Thank you. I am going to bring this to a head, to the relief of all of us, and, again, I think we have touched on it, but I would like to have in the record at this point your observations concerning what, quite frankly, to me, is, to a great extent, the crux of the situation here. That is, the advocacies, so far as you were concerned, with respect to the American position in the Far East, paralleling, to a degree, what most of us are inclined to believe were Soviet Russia's. I refer (1) to the thought of recognizing the Communist government in China today; the suggestion that we abandon Chiang and Formosa; the suggestion that we pull out of Korea, South Korea, insofar as we are in South Korea.

And again, I would like, at this point, for you to explain for me, and for the committee, if you can, by what process of reasoning you have arrived at these conclusions to which I have referred?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Morgan, the question of Formosa, and I believe South Korea, though many people differ with me on South Korea, is this kind of question: Let's take Formosa. It is the clearest example.

The situation in Formosa is not one that can be remedied. Looking at it as coldly as I can, I see no prospect whatever that a government, the remnants of a government which landed upon the island of Formosa, as the remnants of a process of collapse in China, are going to roll back from Formosa to China. It is a hopeless situation.

Nor does Formosa, in my opinion, have the makings of a nation. It certainly does not have the makings of a nation under this government which is not Formosian in character.

As a matter not of the policy I advocate, but the future that I predict, we are going to have to get out of Formosa, in the sense of abandoning any idea of maintaining, by American support, the present rump government in Formosa.

Now comes the question of what policy do you advocate. I think that if you are in a position that you are going to have to abandon, then you lose prestige, and suffer less moral damage if you show that you are able to abandon that position of your own accord, rather than wait until the situation is taken away from you.

Now, I think that the Communists, while they are, of course, protesting, with as much noise as they can make, about the connection between the American policy and the rump government on Formosa, are really hoping that we will stay there as long as possible. They would like to have us hang on; they would like to have us try to hang on to a position that can't be hung on to, because then, when we are finally pushed to let go, as they will represent it, they get a much bigger propaganda story out of it.

Mr. MORGAN. You feel that the Russians would like for us to try to hold on to Formosa?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I am sure they would, and the Chinese Communists, because they are sure we can't do it, and I think that in the long run we can't do it. The situation is something like this: At the time of the great defeat in France, when the British were left with just the remnant of an army on the beaches of Dunkirk, if the British

had responded to that situation and used every ton of shipping they could get to rush everybody from England on to the beach at Dunkirk, that would have delighted every Nazi agent in Britain; instead of which the British extricated themselves from a situation that was no longer tenable and used the resources, manpower, and whatever equipment they could save, extricated from the beaches of Dunkirk, to use successfully in the subsequent conduct of the war from Britain.

And I think that is the kind of situation we have in Formosa.

Now, in connection with these holding point positions, such as Formosa, Korea, Indochina, it seems to me that a grave defect of our policy at the present time is that so much of our resources, and so much of our emotion, is committed to these holding points, and I do not think we can make a successful policy in Asia out of holding points. The only reason for having a holding point is to do something in the spaces behind the holding point.

What we ought to have right now is a program with a lot of resources put into it and real drive behind it in countries like India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Afghanistan, the near eastern countries I don't know so much about, and I won't say anything about them, but if we can get going in those countries, before they themselves become holding points, programs which the people of those countries feel are for their own benefit, not being imposed upon them by America, but arrived at for reasons of mutual benefit, not only between them and America but between them, America, and western Europe, so that we coordinate our large-scale program in western Europe and south Asia, then we can get something going, then there will be a feeling of hope, and then this holding-point psychology will not longer be necessary.

At the present time anything put into Formosa is being frittered away. Anything put into India, Pakistan, Indonesia, has a chance of developing into a big, going concern, and I think it is a grave defect of our policy at the present time that so much attention is concentrated on these holding-point positions which cannot in any event be anything but temporary situations, and the main field of action is being neglected.

I was in India in December of last year, and talking with Indians I was tremendously impressed that the Indians had the feeling that the future of their country, what they were going to do now as an independent country, was a matter of tremendous urgency, and if the Americans were going to come in on it, then they better fish or cut bait—come in on it if they were, stay out if they were going to stay out.

The Americans, on the other hand, seemed to have the idea, "Well, let's see how this thing rocks along; after all, you aren't menaced right now; if we feel like it, we will see about some investment later on—something of that sort. They weren't regarding it as priority. They weren't regarding it as an emergency. They had no sense of urgency. And the situation in Asia, as a whole, is an urgent situation, and the urgency lies in the main features, and not in the detail.

Mr. MORGAN. I have two final questions, Dr. Lattimore.

Is it your feeling, therefore, that any advantages that might stem from the program you suggest would offset and overcome any disadvantages that might result from such a program with respect to, let us say, the Philippines and Japan?



Dr. LATTIMORE. The Philippines and Japan are two very different problems. The Philippine problem is going to be solved in the Philippines. The Philippines are islands off the coast of Asia. Formosa is an island off the coast of Asia, but the internal questions of nationalism, economy, ability to be a nation, and so forth, are utterly different in Formosa and in the Philippines. Japan is a different kind of question.

Japan is a Germany without a ruler. Japan is a country which has got to live by foreign trade, and no longer being an empire it has got to live by foreign trade on terms which it can negotiate, and not on terms which it can enforce, impose.

Mr. MORGAN. Dr. Lattimore, I want to ask you: Has the program which you have advocated with respect to China and the Far East been the result of your independent studies and thinking or are you seeking to project, on behalf of the Soviet Union, a policy in this area?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I think it is self-evident, Mr. Morgan, that that is not a program that can possibly be projected from Russia.

Mr. MORGAN. That is all.

Senator TYDINGS. Senator Hickenlooper.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, I have a number of questions to ask you.

First, I know Mr. Morris, the assistant counsel, has a number of questions to ask, and I ask that he be permitted to ask his questions, as assistant counsel of this committee.

Senator TYDINGS. If Mr. Morris will give me those questions, I will ask them as fast as he can write them.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. My suggestion is that Mr. Morris be permitted to do his own questioning.

Senator TYDINGS. We would like you to proceed now, if you please.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That means that the committee action is that he is not permitted to ask the questions?

Senator TYDINGS. The committee took this up and decided against it, and I don't find I have the authority to override the committee—unless they give me the authority.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Very well.

Dr. Lattimore, let me ask just this preliminary question. It may or may not have pertinence: Where was your mimeographed statement mimeographed? This statement that you read from this morning.

Mr. FORTAS. It was mimeographed by the office that does the mimeographing for us, the law firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It was not mimeographed here on Capitol Hill?

Mr. FORTAS. Oh, no.

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is right; it was not.

Mr. FORTAS. Virginia Bowman. She would appreciate this advertising, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That is perfectly all right. My question was inspired by a suggestion made to me this morning that it was mimeographed here on the Hill and I merely wanted to find out about it.

Mr. FORTAS. If anybody would like to have the bill, Senator, we would be glad to send it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now, Dr. Lattimore, I believe you testified repeatedly, and I am not questioning that testimony at the mo-

ment, that you never met Mr. Budenz, formally, in your life; is that correct?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is correct. Formally or informally, to the best of my recollection. I hope I never do.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It is my recollection of your testimony that you said you had never seen him until he appeared here the other day, a few days ago, to give his testimony, when he originally appeared here?

Dr. LATTIMORE. To the best of my recollection I had never seen him before, and I sincerely hope I never see him again.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And you never had any transactions, such as correspondence, or dealings with him, in any way, in the past?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Therefore you have never had any quarrels with him, or differences with him, of any kind in the past in which you and he might have been involved, some serious dispute of some kind; is that correct?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Nothing besides the little difference of his trying—

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am leaving out the present testimony as an area of dispute.

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is something I am rather unwilling to leave out, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am attempting to ask you whether or not in the past, let's say prior to—

Dr. LATTIMORE. In the past, neither by conversation, correspondence, word of mouth, or telegram, can I put the faintest recollection of the man.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I see.

Now, I think we are bound to be led to one of two, or perhaps three, conclusions with regard to this controversy in connection with Mr. Budenz about you—and these, of course, are alternative assumptions that one might make:

One assumption could be that Mr. Budenz is telling the truth when he charges that he learned officially that you were an instrumentality of the Communist Party. That could be one assumption.

Another assumption could be that he is not telling the truth when he makes that assertion.

Inasmuch as you have never had any association with Mr. Budenz, or any dispute with Mr. Budenz outside of the present dispute, if you can call it that, in this proceeding—that is, involving the McCarthy allegations, and so forth—inasmuch as you have never been acquainted with Mr. Budenz, can you ascribe or do you know of any reason why Mr. Budenz would lie about you or about the information which he alleges to be extant about you, which he claims he got in his official capacity?

Do you know of any reason why he would make these assertions if they are not true?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I should like to repeat, Senator, a passage from my statement this morning.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. What page?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Page B4. [Reading:]

Now, consider the kind of career that Budenz has been following for 5 years. He has made himself a sensational author and lecturer by exploiting his own

past. But the past is the past, and he must be haunted by the fact that his tales of skullduggery and conspiracy may grow stale through sheer repetition. Already there have been new sensational revelations by Government agents who have successfully infiltrated the Communist Party, and who have appeared at trials to give their testimony.

The pressure on Budenz is obvious. When a new sensation breaks out in the press and a man is accused—even if the accusation is false—what is the temptation that is dangled before him? It is the easiest thing in the world for his own memory to be convenient and obliging. He can then rush up and say "I remember him, too"—and thus revive his reputation as the peerless informant.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Then, in short, do I understand you to advance the theory that Mr. Budenz did not necessarily originate this idea about you, but that after someone else had mentioned it, he then joined the pack and said, "I knew him, too"?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Senator, these allegations and charges against me are a tissue not only of lies but of recent lies.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, do I understand your position—

Dr. LATTIMORE. I am in a position where I can only deal with this kind of fantastic performance by exercising my intelligence upon it, and the best conclusion to which my reason leads me is that Budenz was activated by extremely sordid commercial motives of personal career.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am merely trying to establish, if there is to be established, some motive for Mr. Budenz if his statements should be false, reaching into thin air, as it were, and bringing your name into this controversy by way of allegation.

Dr. LATTIMORE. Personal profit is a motive which acts upon people in many ways, unfortunately; at times in extremely sordid and disgraceful ways, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. But I take it that you have no direct evidence that personal profit has induced him to name you in this controversy?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I have the evidence that Mr. Budenz pursues a spectacular career by lecturing and writing as an expert on all things Communist. He has been 5 years, presumably, cut off from his sources by the nature of the way in which he himself says that he left this conspiracy, and if he is running short of material, he appears to me, by his actions and words, to be the kind of man who will stoop to this kind of dirty work.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes. Would you call that guilt by associations, Dr. Lattimore, that sort of analysis of why Mr. Budenz' actions, you conclude, are motivated by those things?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Guilt by Mr. Budenz' association with Mr. Budenz; yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In other words, I take it that you are engaging then in assumption of what motivated Mr. Budenz by putting various speculations together and coming to a conclusion?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Senator, Budenz has tried to do to me things about as filthy as anyone who calls himself an American can do to another American. I am not going to attribute to him any charitable motive.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think you have made that very clear, Dr. Lattimore.

In an attempt to try and find out the facts in this case I am concerned about whatever proof there may be in existence, whether you may be able to supply it or whether someone else may be able to supply it.

First, as to whether or not Mr. Budenz is telling the truth in his testimony; if he is not telling the truth, what is the motivating influence for picking you out of the thin air, as it were, and naming you as the Communist functionary, according to his own words? That is what I am interested in.

Dr. LATTIMORE. I can see no motive, except Mr. Budenz's idea of Budenz's advantage.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In other words, Mr. Budenz, according to that theory, could reach out and arbitrarily pick anyone and name them as a Communist functionary?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Senator, Budenz has been waving 400 undeclared names, which he may pin on anybody.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, you just returned from Afghanistan; did you not?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You went there as a representative of the United Nations; is that correct? Just what was the capacity?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I went there as the head of what was called an exploratory mission for the United Nations technical aid program.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Who paid the expense of that trip; that is, your expense?

Dr. LATTIMORE. United Nations.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did the State Department pay any part of that directly?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It came directly from the United Nations?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And in a recent trip last summer you were in Alaska; is that correct?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is correct.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Was that a private trip purely or did it have any official connections in any way?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I went on that trip to Alaska as deputy for President Bronk, of Johns Hopkins University, who is one of the directors of the Arctic Research Laboratory at Point Barrow.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now, that trip, were your expenses paid by the State Department?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Who was responsible for the expenses of that trip?

Dr. LATTIMORE. As far as I can recall the expenses were borne by the Arctic Research Laboratory.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And who accompanied you on that trip, Doctor?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Oh, there must have been a dozen people or so. The minutes are in the record, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Was Mr. Stefansson, the explorer, with you on that trip?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You are acquainted with Mr. Stefansson, are you not?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I cannot pronounce his first name. If you were to tell me how to do it, I would appreciate it.

Dr. LATTIMORE. V-i-l-h-j-a-l-m-u-r.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Stefansson has been quite active in the past several years in various political sociological activities, has he not?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Are you interested, you and Mrs. Lattimore, interested in any property with Mr. Stefansson?

Dr. LATTIMORE. We have joint ownership of a farm in Vermont.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And where is the location of that farm?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Bethel, Vt.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You have an undivided, you and Mrs. Lattimore have an undivided half interest in this farm, do you not?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. When did you acquire that?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Last summer, of 1949.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you spend some time up there, or have you?

Dr. LATTIMORE. We spent a couple of months there last summer. I had some Mongols with me, from our research group at Johns Hopkins, and I was engaged there in taking down material from them, and in translation work from Mongol sources.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did Mr. Stefansson stay there at the time?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Stefansson was at his house part of the time; not the whole time.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Well, it is your house as well as his; is it not?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No; he has a house on the property which belongs to him and there is an adjoining property, about a half mile away, through some woods, in which he has a half interest and we have a half interest, and the house in which we have a half interest is on that other property.

Senator TYDINGS. Are the two homes separate?

Dr. LATTIMORE. About a half mile apart.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Is Mr. Stefansson the assistant director of the Arctic Institute of North America, do you know?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I believe he is; yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you know the Chinese Tung Piwu?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I don't believe I have ever met him.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In that event, you have never had a meeting with him, and others, some years ago, 4 or 5 years ago.

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. At any place?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now, I notice in your testimony, Mr. Lattimore, today, as I recall, the Budenz charges, as far as you know, were the first, as I understand your testimony, and if I am incorrect you may correct me, as I understand your testimony the Budenz charges against you were the first charges that you were aware of,

or the first insinuations that you were aware of as to any possible Communist connections that you might have; is that substantially correct?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Senator McCarthy came before Budenz and Kohlberg went pretty far before Senator McCarthy.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Kohlberg's allegations, or whatever they were, were in connection with the Institute of Pacific Relations activities, is that correct?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Also in connection with me personally.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I noticed on pages B 6 and 7 of your statement, in connection with the appearance of Mr. Whittaker Chambers before the House Un-American Activities Committee, that they questioned, Mr. Stripling questioned, Mr. Chambers about any acquaintance with you at that time?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe Mr. Chambers said that he had none, and I believe you testified, as I recall, that you had no acquaintance with Mr. Chambers.

Dr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember testimony—it may have been the first time I was here—in any case, no, no connection.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now, on page C 5 of your statement, I call your attention to the paragraph beginning in the middle of the page as follows [reading]:

And in the same period—

This is referring, as I understand it, to the Institute of Pacific Relations publication—

And in the same period we published at least 94 contributions out of the 250 that were definitely to the right of center.

Does that indicate, Dr. Lattimore, that the other 156 were to the left of center, the balance of the articles in this publication?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. The balance are articles that are on scientific or bibliographical or political, entirely colorless subjects.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It is my recollection, Dr. Lattimore, that General Thorpe testified when he was before this committee that you saw classified documents when you were down at the last post of command where he was stationed; is that correct?

If I am not correct in my assumption, I wish you would correct me.

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I recall his testimony on that subject, Senator, and I have not conferred with him on that subject, but to the best of my recollection when I was in Tokyo I went in several times to see General Thorpe, and to talk with him about various subjects. I don't think there is any harm in saying that subject on which I probably conferred with him in most detail was the fact that there were a number of Mongols in Japan who had been brought over by the Japanese before and during the war. General Thorpe apparently did not know about them, but I had known that they must be there because I had known something about the Japanese Mongol from the Mongol side before that. So I went in to urge him to get some of the Mongols down. At first I urged him to get hold of them. Then he made inquiry and found that they had all been segregated at a university up in northern Japan. Then I suggested that he get some down. He found out how many there were, and it was obviously too large a number to

bring all of them down, and I suggested to him the classification on which he should bring them down to Tokyo for interrogation, that classification being by region from which they came, tribal affiliation, and that kind of thing. This was done eventually but only after I left Japan, because the airfield where they were was snowed in.

Now, in connection with that kind of question and other questions, he may have shown me classified documents, but I can't, I confess that I cannot recall any single classified document shown to me, or even whether classified documents were shown to me. It may be that I was cleared in his department as a person to whom classified documents could be shown, and yet no occasion came up for showing them, and, therefore, I wasn't shown any. But my memory is not entirely clear on the subject.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, did you ever urge or recommend to an official of the American Government that the United States recognize the independence and sovereignty of Mongolia after it had set up its, as you referred, I believe, a while ago, its de facto independence from China?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Well, I have recommended in books that outer Mongolia should be recognized, and I may have recommended it in that memorandum of August 1949, but I can't recall any other occasion.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you recall whether or not you, or would you say whether or not you strongly represented that in, let's say, the late thirties, the then recognition by the United States of the independence and sovereignty of Mongolia—I don't know whether you would refer to it as Outer Mongolia.

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is the general term. I can't recall it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Would you say that you had not so recommended?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, I might have. I don't recall any occasion on which I did so.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. When was it that the Russian secret police and political police moved into Outer Mongolia and actually took over the physical control, and by that I don't mean that they put their own persons in the elective offices, but the secret police and the enforcement branch from Russia, moved in and took over the practical control of Outer Mongolia?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, sir. In fact, I don't know if they have that kind of control in Outer Mongolia today. It is a subject on which I work continuously accumulating information as best I can, but I don't have the positive answer.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Wasn't there a time around 1935 or 1936, the dates of which I cannot specifically place, when there was reported a so-called revolutionary activity in Outer Mongolia which set up some new officials there and changed the complexion of the then existing government?

Dr. LATTIMORE. There was a time—Let's see how close I can date it—about 1931, 1932, along in there, when there was a year of rather acute trouble in outer Mongolia, the nature of which was that they attempted their move considerably to the left of where they had been, and then decided that was a bad move, and moved back over toward the right of center.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Wasn't there a disturbance, or revolution in Outer Mongolia in the thirties in which the Russian secret police and other Russian secret forces, that is nonuniformed forces, I might say, moved in and after a certain blood-purge succeeded in getting people friendly to them established in the Government of Outer Mongolia?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, sir. There was a Mongolian purge after this leftward move that failed. Whether that Mongol purge was conducted by Russia or at the instigation of the Russians, I don't know. In 1924 there was a much bigger change of regime in Outer Mongolia, and most Mongols attribute the beginning of stronger Russian influence to that period.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, did you ever address an organization in Washington known as the Washington Book Shop, or make addresses up there under your sponsorship?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Not that I recall, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did you speak before a Washington committee to aid China which was sponsored by the American League for Peace and Democracy about 1941?

Dr. LATTIMORE. About, I think, a little earlier than that, 1939 or 1940, I spoke at a committee for the—a meeting in a church somewhere here in Washington, sponsored by the Washington Committee for Aid to China, but I do not believe that they—what was that other committee?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. American League for Peace and Democracy.

Dr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe that was the sponsor.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. After Philip Jaffe was arrested in the Am-  
erasia case, did you furnish any character references for Mr. Jaffe?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe so. I haven't seen Mr. Jaffe since about 1940 or 1941.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you think that you would recall if you had furnished character references for him?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I should think I would; yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And so far as you recall, you did not?

Dr. LATTIMORE. As far as I can recall, I did not.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You were in China in June of 1937, were you not?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And you were in Yunnan at that time?

Dr. LATTIMORE. About then; yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You made a trip to Yunnan.

Dr. LATTIMORE. It was in June, I think.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. How long was the duration of that trip?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Oh, I forget how long the total duration of the trip was overland to Yunnan; we spent, I think, 3 or 4 days in Yunnan—and, by the way, Mr. Chairman, I have just discovered the notebook that I kept while I was in Yunnan. I would like to submit it as an exhibit to show the routine nature of the interviews, on which I took notes, and the routine nature of the notes indicates why I didn't feel that there was anything that I could publish after such a trip.

Senator TYDINGS. You are just lending it to us for reference?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I should like to have it back for my files, if I may.



Senator HICKENLOOPER. On this trip to Yunan, Dr. Lattimore, you were accompanied by Philip Jaffe and by T. A. Bisson, or either of them?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Both of them, sir. I think there was a fairly complete account of that in my first statement, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did you know Gerhart Eisler in China?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; nor anywhere else.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Referring to Gerhart Eisler, is it possible that he could have gone under any other name where his identity might have become known to you later as Gerhart Eisler?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I doubt it, Senator. I never knew that Gerhart Eisler had been—who he was, or that he had been in China—until I saw the newspaper accounts here, and, as I recall from those newspaper accounts, he was in South China, where the Communists and Kuomintang united front of that period was operating, and at that time I was traveling across Mongolia and central Asia.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did a man by the name of Loomis, a man who went under the name of Loomis, at least, ever arrange to furnish information supplied by you to Moscow in Soviet diplomatic pouches, the Soviet diplomatic pouch?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe you were in Yokohama in 1934, were you not?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yokohama, 1934? I may have passed through Yokohama, probably did pass through Yokohama on the way back from America to China in 1934; yes. I don't remember any Loomis, though.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Sir?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember any Loomis there.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The Loomis had nothing to do with this particular question.

The trip was made by boat?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Was Agnus Smedley along on the boat on that trip?

Dr. LATTIMORE. She was on that boat; yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. She made the trip from this country to Yokohama then at the same time?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember whether she made the trip from this country or joined the boat in Yokohama. Let me see now. I was on that boat for part of the time with her but not the whole trip.

Incidentally, that was the first time I had met her and the trip was not by prearrangement.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, do you know a person by the name of Miyagi Yotoku?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall. My memory for Japanese names is not as good as my memory for Chinese names but that sounds completely strange to me.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, did Mrs. Lattimore, your wife, lecture before the Tom Mooney School in California?

Dr. LATTIMORE. You will have to ask her, sir; she is right here.

Can't recall it, she says.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And you no knowledge of your own as to whether or not she did?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No; I haven't, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, we discussed for a moment, on your previous appearance here, the matter of the picnic at your place, I believe, in Maryland, outside of Baltimore, at the time the arrests were made in the Amerasia case, perhaps a day or so before that, and that at that time, do I recall correctly, that you said Mr. Roth was there?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Is he married, and if so, was his wife there?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think his wife was there.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And was Phillip Jaffe there?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Was John Service there?

Dr. LATTIMORE. He was there.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The purpose of their visit at your house, in addition to attending a picnic, I believe you said, was to examine the manuscript, or some book in preparation that one of them was writing?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Roth was going through the galley proofs of his book, Dilemma in Japan, and as a good deal younger man, writing—I am not sure that it was his first book—yes; I think it was his first book—I am not sure, but as a younger author, he very flatteringly asked me if I would look at the galleys and make any suggestions that could be made at the galley proof stage, and so on.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And Mr. Service, what was his connection with the meeting?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Service, as I have been saying this afternoon, was a friend of a good many years, I had seen something of him in Chungking, he had been back in Washington for some time, I don't recall just how long, and it was the first chance to offer him hospitality, so my wife and I asked him to come over.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And he was not there for the purpose of examining the galley proofs of this book?

Dr. LATTIMORE. He may have looked at the galley proofs, being a foreign service officer, specializing in the Far East he could have been expected to be interested, but I don't recall whether he did or not.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And he did not bring or take away the galley proofs, is that true, or did Mr. Roth do that?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall, sir. The only galley proofs I saw were Mr. Roth's.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I will hand you, merely to refresh your recollection, if possible, a tear sheet from the paper The People's World, Wednesday, April 28, 1943. I call your attention to an advertisement that appears on page 3 of that paper as the tear-sheet shows, headed San Francisco, and in a box "Lecture by Mrs. Owen Lattimore, China and the War, Friday, April 30, 8 p. m., Tom Mooney Labor School, 678 Turk Street, Admission 50 Cents."

I will hand you that for your reference, to see whether or not it may refresh your recollection, or that of Mrs. Lattimore.

Dr. LATTIMORE. She says that she could have. She talked at a great many places in those years.

May I ask, Senator, if there is any reason why anyone should not speak at the Tom Mooney School; is there anything sinister about it?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I hadn't suggested any, one way or the other, Dr. Lattimore, I am merely asking as to facts.

Did you ever know or meet Richard Sorge?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No. I don't recall ever meeting him, and I don't think I could have.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You know to whom I refer?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. He was the subject of an investigation and report on espionage activities in the Orient.

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. If I may have returned that tear sheet, if you are through with it.

Now, do you know whether or not the People's World is one of the official publications of the Communist Party, or was in 1943?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I couldn't tell you, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. On your visit to Yunnan that we mentioned a moment ago, I take it you had been in Yunnan before?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I had never been there before.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In your life in China?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did you have anything to do with the arrangement for Edgar Snow's trip into Communist territory in connection with securing necessary information for his book or writings on Red Star Over China?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I didn't even know about it, the preparations for it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. On your trip to Yunnan, did you lecture, or make any addresses, address or addresses to Chinese Communist troops?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I made one speech, or partial address. They had an open air meeting, for hospitality to the visiting group, and I spoke there, rather briefly, in the open air.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you know Harriet Lavine Chi?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I used to know her many years ago, yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Is she not the present proposed delegate to the United Nations of the Chinese Communists?

Dr. LATTIMORE. She is or was the wife of Chao-Ting Chi, yes. I don't know whether they are still married or not.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And he is the man who is either now here or waiting the action of the United Nations to become the delegate for the China government of the Communists?

Dr. LATTIMORE. So I hear, yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Harriet Lavine Chi was at one time your secretary, was she not?

Dr. LATTIMORE. She worked for, I think, something like a week, as my secretary, a week, or it may have been two weeks, in the summer of 1936, when the preparations were being made for the 1936 conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and we had a number of temporary secretaries and stenographers.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That is the only time she was ever employed by you or worked with you?

Dr. LATTIMORE. She was not employed by me.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. She was employed to work for you?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I do not mean necessarily that you paid her.

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Was that the only time that she ever performed any work for you?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is the only time I recall.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Is she Philip Jaffe's niece?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, sir.

Senator TYDINGS. Dr. Lattimore, the hour is getting pretty late, and you have had a pretty long session. I wonder if it wouldn't be convenient for you to be here at 10:15 tomorrow morning?

Dr. LATTIMORE. If you so desire, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have a great many more questions that I want to ask. I don't care to hold the committee here.

Senator TYDINGS. Senator Hickenlooper has some other questions he would like to ask; so I think we might make it at 10 tomorrow morning, so that we can get back on our other schedule.

Senator LODGE. Let me say, if the decision not to permit any questioning in executive session is adhered to, I would be constrained to ask some questions myself.

Senator TYDINGS. All right. Senator Lodge will have some questions. I think we might as well meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. So if it is convenient to the committee we will recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 5:30 p. m., the committee recessed to reconvene on Wednesday, May 3, 1950, at 10 a. m.)

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE  
LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTED UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 231,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to an adjournment taken on May 2, 1950, at 10 a. m., in the caucus room, room 318, Senate Office Building, Senator Millard E. Tydings (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Tydings, Green, McMahon, Hickenlooper, and Lodge.

Also present: Senator Knowland; Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel for the subcommittee; and Robert Morris, assistant counsel for the subcommittee.

Senator TYDINGS. The committee will come to order.

While we are waiting to get started, I have written to General Marshall, Cordel Hull, Secretary Byrnes, and Secretary Acheson, inquiring of each of them, in identical or similar letters, what influence Mr. Lattimore had on the far eastern policy, and whether he was the chief architect on the State Department's far eastern policy.

Each of them replied and I would like to have these inserted in the record, both my letters and the replies thereto.

APRIL 17, 1950.

Gen. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,  
*American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: It has been stated by Senator McCarthy during the course of the hearings now being held by the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under Senate Resolution 231, that Mr. Owen Lattimore is "the principal architect of our far eastern policy."

It is important for our committee to determine the truth of this contention for whatever bearing it may have on other evidence adduced in the Lattimore matter. For that reason, I would appreciate it greatly if you would inform me at your earliest possible convenience of the extent to which, in your opinion, Dr. Lattimore was "the principal architect of our far eastern policy" or the extent that Dr. Lattimore influenced our far eastern policy during the period in which you were Secretary of State.

I am addressing a similar letter to Secretary Acheson, Mr. Hull, and Mr. Byrnes.

Thanking you for your kindness in giving the committee this information, I am  
Very respectfully,

PINEHURST, N. C., April 22, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I have received your letter of April 17 in which you refer to a recent statement, in connection with the hearings of the Subcommittee on Foreign Relations under Senate Resolution 231, that "Owen Lattimore

is the principal architect of our far eastern policy." Your letter then asks the extent to which, in my opinion, "Lattimore was the principal architect of our far eastern policy" during the period in which I served as Secretary of State.

The statement referred to above is completely without basis in fact.

So far as I and my associates can recall, I never even met Mr. Lattimore.

I take the liberty of commenting on the harmful effect on our foreign relations of such statements, charges, or insinuations broadcast with so little regard for the truth. They undoubtedly confuse our friends abroad, undermine and weaken our position before the world, and actually lend assistance to the powers that would destroy us.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

APRIL 17, 1950.

Hon. CORDELL HULL,  
*Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HULL: It has been stated by Senator McCarthy during the course of the hearings now being held by the Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under Senate Resolution 231, that Mr. Owen Lattimore is "the principal architect of our far eastern policy."

It is important for our committee to determine the truth of this contention for whatever bearing it may have on other evidence adduced in the Lattimore matter. For that reason, I would appreciate it greatly if you would inform me at your earliest possible convenience of the extent to which, in your opinion, Dr. Lattimore was "the principal architect of our far eastern policy," or the extent that Dr. Lattimore influenced our far eastern policy during the period in which you were Secretary of State.

I am addressing a similar letter to Secretary Acheson, Mr. Byrnes, and General Marshall.

Thanking you for your kindness in giving the committee this information, I am  
Very respectfully,

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 20, 1950.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I have your letter of April 17 in which you inquire concerning the extent to which, in my opinion, Dr. Owen Lattimore was "the principal architect of our far eastern policy" or the extent he influenced our far eastern policy while I was Secretary of State.

In my opinion, he was in no sense the "principal architect" of our far eastern policy during the period I served as Secretary of State. Although his position in academic circles as a student of and writer on some aspects of Chinese life and history was, of course, known to us, I am not aware that during this period he had any appreciable influence on our far eastern policy. I do not remember having consulted with him on that subject or on any subject at any time.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

APRIL 17, 1950.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,  
*Spartanburg, S. C.*

DEAR MR. BYRNES: It has been stated by Senator McCarthy during the course of the hearings now being held by the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under Senate Resolution 231, that Mr. Owen Lattimore is "the principal architect of our far eastern policy."

It is important for our committee to determine the truth of this contention for whatever bearing it may have on other evidence adduced in the Lattimore matter. For that reason, I would appreciate it greatly if you would inform me at your earliest possible convenience of the extent to which, in your opinion, Dr. Lattimore was "the principal architect of our far eastern policy," or the extent that Dr. Lattimore influenced our far eastern policy during the period in which you were Secretary of State.

I am addressing a similar letter to Secretary Acheson, Mr. Hull, and General Marshall.

Thanking you for your kindness in giving the committee this information, I am

Very respectfully,

SPARTANBURG, S. C., April 24, 1950.

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MILLARD: I have your letter of the 17th asking the extent to which, in my opinion, Mr. Owen Lattimore was "the principal architect of our far-eastern policy" or the extent he influenced our far-eastern policy during the period I was Secretary of State.

I do not know Mr. Lattimore. If he ever wrote me about the far-eastern policy the letter was not called to my attention. If, while I was Secretary of State, he discussed our far-eastern policy with any officials of the Department concerned with that policy, in their discussions with me they did not quote him.

Early in December 1945 Gen. George C. Marshall went to China and thereafter his reports to the President and me influenced our policies in China and the Far East. I do not think General Marshall was influenced by Mr. Lattimore.

To my former colleagues, I take the liberty of adding that, regardless of the merits of complaints as to what has heretofore occurred, the President and the Secretary of State have given proof of their desire to restore the bipartisan policy in our foreign affairs, and I earnestly hope the Members of the Senate will cooperate in that effort.

While I was Secretary of State I found I could talk to Senator Vandenberg with the same freedom with which I talked to Senator Connally and to my assistants, and I profited by his advice. I am sure that in his absence other Republican Senators will cooperate just as did Senator Vandenberg. It is extremely important at this time, in view of the tenseness of the situation in world affairs, that we do not give to either our friends or enemies abroad the false impression of a serious division among us in our policies as to the Soviet Government. Seldom in history have our people been so united on any issue.

I hope that, regardless of our differences on domestic issues, our political leaders can present a united front in our foreign relations.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

APRIL 17, 1950.

HON. DEAN ACHESON,  
*Secretary of State,  
Department of State, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been stated by Senator McCarthy during the course of the hearings now being held by the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under Senate Resolution 231, that Mr. Owen Lattimore is "the principal architect of our far-eastern policy."

It is important for our committee to determine the truth of this contention for whatever bearing it may have on other evidence adduced in the Lattimore matter. For that reason, I would appreciate it greatly if you would inform me at your earliest possible convenience of the extent to which, in your opinion, Dr. Lattimore was "the principal architect of our far-eastern policy," or the extent that Dr. Lattimore influenced our far-eastern policy during the period in which you have been Secretary of State.

I am addressing a similar letter to Mr. Hull, Mr. Byrnes, and General Marshall. Thanking you for your kindness in giving the committee this information, I am

Very respectfully,

APRIL 27, 1950.

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: In a letter dated April 17, 1950, you asked that I inform you of the extent to which, in my opinion, Mr. Owen Lattimore was the

"principal architect of our far eastern policy," or the extent to which he influenced our far eastern policy during the period in which I have been Secretary of State. On April 17 Mr. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, wrote you in full detail concerning Mr. Lattimore's connections with this Department in the past. The far eastern policy of this Government, like all other foreign policy, is the responsibility of the Secretary of State and has been made by me in my administration, subject, of course, to the direction of the President. I welcome this opportunity to state personally and categorically that during the period in which I have been Secretary, Mr. Lattimore, so far as I am concerned or am aware, has had no influence in the determination of our far eastern policy. There is clearly no basis in fact for describing Mr. Lattimore as the "principal architect" of our far eastern policy. I might add that, so far as I am aware, I have never met Mr. Lattimore.

The far eastern policy of the United States has at all times been determined after careful study by the responsible officers of the Department and an objective evaluation by me of all of the facts available to this Government. The Department of State has explored all avenues to arrive at the relevant facts. The measure of the participation of Mr. Lattimore, so far as this Department and I am concerned, is fully and fairly indicated in the letter of April 17 from Mr. Peurifoy.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

APRIL 17, 1950.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
*United States senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Following Senator McCarthy's statement on March 21 that a top Russian espionage agent, whom he privately identified as Mr. Owen Lattimore, was an employee or consultant of the State Department, I submitted to your subcommittee a brief statement of Mr. Lattimore's connections with this Department, as revealed by a careful check of our personnel records. Since Mr. Lattimore has been publicly identified and since there has been considerable public discussion concerning his relationship with the Department, it is now appropriate to give in greater detail the instances of connections between Mr. Lattimore and the Department. Without any intention of reflecting on Mr. Lattimore and for the purpose of setting the record straight, I believe I should state that Mr. Lattimore does not have a desk in the Department of State nor access to its files, and is neither an employee nor a top adviser of the Department. These are the facts:

On October 15, 1945, Mr. Owen Lattimore was appointed as an economic adviser to the United States Reparations Mission to Japan. He served with the mission until February 12, 1946. While on this assignment he was paid out of the Department's international conferences funds.

Mr. Lattimore was 1 of 28 persons to lecture on a program known as Meet the Public, which was given at the Department's Foreign Service Institute. He gave one lecture on June 5, 1946. This program was initiated by the Department's Office of Public Affairs and was designed to bring before departmental personnel the viewpoints of various persons who were working on, or interested in, foreign affairs. In this capacity, Mr. Lattimore was not an employee of the Department and received no remuneration. The following were the speakers on this program:

Senator J. William Fulbright  
Mr. Ernest K. Lindley, chief of the Washington bureau of Newsweek  
Senator Warren Austin  
Dr. Arthur Compton, chancellor of Washington University, St. Louis.  
Mr. Charles Bolte, chairman of the American Veterans' Committee.  
Congressman Jerry Voorhis.  
Prof. Owen Lattimore, director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations, Johns Hopkins University.  
Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Williams College.  
Mr. Herbert Elliston, editor of the Washington Post.  
Mr. Eugene Meyer, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.  
Dr. Jacob Viner, professor of economics, Princeton University.  
Dr. Harold Lasswell, professor of law, Yale University.  
Mr. Wallace Deuel, editor of the Chicago News.  
Senator Wayne Morse.



Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, vice chairman of Americans United for World Government, Inc.

Mr. James M. Landis, chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mrs. Vera Micheles Dean, editor and research director of the Foreign Policy Association.

Mr. Kermit Eby, director of education and research, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. Hamilton Owens, editor of the Baltimore Sun (and Sun papers).

Prof. Frank Tannenbaum, Columbia University.

Mr. Gardner Murphy, American Psychological Association.

Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, vice president of Georgetown University and regent of the School of Foreign Service.

Mr. David Lawrence, editor of the United States News and of the World Report.

Mr. Robert Watt, international representative of the American Federation of Labor.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Dr. Dexter Perkins, professor of Latin-American affairs, University of Rochester. Congressman Mike Mansfield.

Dr. James P. Baxter, president of Williams College.

On October 6, 7, and 8, 1949, Mr. Lattimore, following preliminary correspondence with the Department of State, was one of a group of 25 private individuals participating in a round-table discussion arranged by the Office of Public Affairs for the purpose of exchanging views on United States foreign policy toward China. As a member of this group, Mr. Lattimore was not an employee of the Department and received no compensation but was reimbursed for expenses. This round-table discussion followed a solicitation of written views on the same topic from a larger group in response to which the written views of 31 private individuals were received and analyzed. Some of the members, including Mr. Lattimore, were in both groups. Both the written views received and the transcript of the round-table discussions were made available as some of the background material for consideration by Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick, Mr. Everett Case, and Ambassador Jessup, who had been requested by the Secretary to review United States policy toward the Far East. The 31 who expressed views initially in writing were:

Former Consul General Joseph W. Bullantine, now at Brookings Institution.

Prof. Hugh Borton, Columbia University.

Former President Isalah Bowman, Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. A. J. Brunbaugh, American Council on Education, Washington.

Former Ambassador William Bullitt.

Former Under Secretary Castle.

Former Consul John A. Embry.

Prof. Rupert Emerson, Harvard University.

Dr. Charles B. Fahs, New York City.

Prof. John K. Fairbank, Harvard University.

Dr. Huntington Gilchrist, New York City.

Prof. Carrington Goodrich, Columbia University.

Former Under Secretary Grew.

Col. Robert A. Griffin, former Deputy Administrator, ECA, China.

Former Ambassador Stanley K. Hornbeck.

Roger Lapham, former Administrator, ECA, China.

Prof. Kenneth S. Latourette, Yale University.

Prof. Owen Lattimore, Johns Hopkins University.

Oliver C. Lockhart, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Walter H. Mallory, Council on Foreign Relations.

Prof. Wallace Moore, Occidental College, Los Angeles.

Prof. Edwin O. Reischauer, Harvard University.

C. A. Richards, Economic Cooperation Administration.

Former Minister Walter S. Robertson, Richmond, Va.

Dr. Lawrence K. Rosinger, New York City.

Mr. James Rowe, Washington.

Mrs. Virginia Thompson (Adloff), New York City.

Prof. Amry Vandenbosch, University of Kentucky.

Prof. Kari A. Wittfogel, Columbia University.

Prof. Mary Wright, Stanford University.

Admiral Yarnell.

The 25 who attended the round-table discussions were:

Joseph W. Ballantine, the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.  
 Bernard Brodie, Department of International Relations, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.  
 Claude A. Buss, Director of Studies, Army War College, Washington, D. C.  
 Kenneth Colegrove, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.  
 Arthur G. Coons, president, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Calif.  
 John W. Decker, International Missionary Council, New York, N. Y.  
 John K. Fairbank, Committee on International and Regional Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 William R. Herod, president, International General Electric Co., New York, N. Y.  
 Arthur N. Holcombe, Department of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Benjamin H. Kizer, Graves, Kizer & Graves, Spokane, Wash.  
 Owen Lattimore, director, Walter Hines Page School of International Relations, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
 Ernest B. MacNaughton, chairman of the board, First National Bank, Portland, Ore.  
 George C. Marshall, president, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.  
 J. Morden Murphy, assistant vice president, Bankers Trust Co., New York, N. Y.  
 Nathaniel Peffer, department of public law and government, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.  
 Harold S. Quigley, department of political science, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.  
 Edwin O. Reischauer, department of far eastern languages, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 William S. Robertson, president, American & Foreign Power Co., New York, N. Y.  
 John D. Rockefeller III, president Rockefeller Brothers' Fund, New York, N. Y.  
 Lawrence K. Rosinger, American Institute of Pacific Relations, New York, N. Y.  
 Eugene Staley, executive director, World Affairs Council of Northern California, San Francisco, Calif.  
 Harold Stassen, president, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Phillips Talbot, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.  
 George E. Taylor, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.  
 Harold M. Vinacke, department of political science, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The following were invited to the round table October 6, 7, and 8, 1949, but did not attend:

W. Langbourne Bond, Pan American Airways, Washington, D. C.  
 Monroe E. Deutsch, provost, University of California.  
 Anne O'Hare McCormick, New York Times.  
 Moris T. Moore, chairman of the board of Time, Inc.  
 Michael Ross, director, department of international affairs, CIO.  
 J. E. Wallace Sterling, president, Stanford University.

In order to ascertain whether any facts whatsoever might support Senator McCarthy's assertions that Mr. Lattimore has a desk in the Department, access to its files, and a position as a top adviser on far-Eastern affairs, a check has been made with officers of the Department who have been concerned with the Far East, and many of whom have come to know Mr. Lattimore, who is widely regarded as one of the leading experts in this field. Beyond the normal contacts found among persons having a common specialized professional training and interest, this check developed only that Mr. Lattimore, as director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations of Johns Hopkins University, has participated in setting up at Johns Hopkins a Mongolian language project in which the Department is interested. The Department of State, in line with the policy of promoting and utilizing foreign language and other international studies in numerous American universities, has, under authority of Public Law 724 (79th Cong.), entered into a contract with the Johns Hopkins University, pursuant to which it has contributed \$3,200 toward this language project. Very much larger sums have been made available for this project, it is understood, by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Carnegie Foundation. In connection with this project, it was possible to arrange for three Mongol scholars, including Dilowa Hutuktu, or the "Living Buddha," to enter the United States and work in the Walter Hines Page School in Baltimore. Officers of the Department's Foreign Service Institute have visited the project from time to time to observe its progress, and a junior member of the Foreign Service Staff, a specialist on the Far East,

whose salary is \$4,050 a year, is studying at the Walter Hines Page School as part of this project. The end results of the project will be a descriptive grammar of the Mongolian language and other teaching materials in spoken Mongolian.

Mr. Lattimore was recently sent by the Secretariat of the United Nations as a member of a preliminary economic survey mission to Afghanistan. In this capacity, Mr. Lattimore was hired by and responsible to the United Nations and not the Department of State.

Mr. Lattimore does not have a desk in the Department of State, nor does he have access to its files. Of course, in connection with his OWI employment (1942-45) and his 4-month assignment to the Pauley Reparations Mission which terminated February 12, 1946, Mr. Lattimore like others in such positions, might have been required as part of his duties to consider some official papers from other agencies of the Government, including the Department of State.

These are the facts.

Sincerely yours,

*Deputy Under Secretary.*

All right, Senator Hickenlooper, whenever you are ready.

#### TESTIMONY OF DR. OWEN LATTIMORE—Resumed

DR. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, may I first hand in some of the things I was requested to hand in yesterday?

Senator TYDINGS. What are they, Mr. Lattimore?

DR. LATTIMORE. First, Mr. Chairman, I have here two exhibits. One is my memorandum to the generalissimo, which the committee wanted to examine—

Senator TYDINGS. That will be filed.

Is it identified on the cover?

DR. LATTIMORE. It is identified on the cover.

Senator TYDINGS. Hand it over to the stenographer.

(The document referred to was passed to the committee reporter for filing with the committee.)

DR. LATTIMORE. Second is the diary of my trip to Yenan. In connection with this diary, Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw attention to one fact, lest any misapprehension should arise: The diary consists entirely of interviews with Communist leaders at Yenan; but at the end there are some names on a separate sheet. I did not want to tear out that sheet, to make the notebook seem mutilated, but I do not want to leave the names in there without guarding against misapprehension. The names are the names of Christians, Chinese, and British, and they are noted on that page because, while I was at Yenan, a Chinese Christian doctor came up to me and said that he was working in the region, that he was afraid that he would be denounced to his colleagues, and the British, and would I please write to his colleagues and take out some letters for him, and to say that he was there, not because he was a Communist, but because, as a Christian and a doctor, he felt it his duty to remain in an area which had been taken over by the Communists, to show that it had not been abandoned by Christians, and men of his profession.

That is the only reason his name is in there.

Senator TYDINGS. You want those names in the diary treated in confidence, and you are submitting it for the information of the committee?

DR. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. And you want it returned?

DR. LATTIMORE. Yes; returned to me, if you please.

Senator TYDINGS. The stenographer will so note.

What was the year of the Yen-an visit?

Dr. LATTIMORE. 1937.

Senator TYDINGS. 1937?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. And the diary is for 1937?

Dr. LATTIMORE. At the time I was there.

(The diary was passed to the committee reporter.)

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead.

Dr. LATTIMORE. I should then like to hand in some quotations from my own writings.

The question was raised—

Senator TYDINGS. Do you want those back, or just filed?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Filed for the record.

Senator TYDINGS. Filed for the record, as exhibit 87.

Dr. LATTIMORE. In this connection, I should like to remark, Mr. Chairman, that the question of whether I am against Russian expansion, and against the spread of communism, is something that is implicit throughout my writings. As a political scientist, and not a propagandist, my writing has not taken the form of mere hostile denunciation. I have always been a loyal American citizen, devoted to the best interests of my country; and my anti-Communist view is primarily expressed in the fact that I have repeatedly advocated programs that would limit the expansion of Russia, as a state; and limit the expansion of Communism as an ideology. Therefore, it is positively expressed, and not negatively expressed, in terms of denunciation.

Senator TYDINGS. It will be filed for the record, as exhibit 87.

(The document was passed to the committee reporter.)

Dr. LATTIMORE. Thirdly, I should like to add to this record a file of attacks on me in the Communist press. I should like to say that these were gathered primarily by my wife while I was away in Afghanistan, before I returned. They do not represent a thorough searching of the Soviet press; as the Soviet press is not indexed in this country, and it is an expensive and long-time business to search the entire record, particularly as my writings fall under the head of geography, history, anthropology, as well as political science.

Therefore, a very wide search would have to be undertaken; and in this connection, Mr. Senator, I should like to make one further observation:

Reflecting last night on the trend of some of the questions yesterday, which I realize were devoted to the eliciting of facts, and which I realized represented the fact that the shadow of McCarthyism hangs over the whole procedure of our public life, as well as over me personally, I nevertheless found certain things that both as a university professor, and as an author, I thought might represent perhaps a dangerous trend in our whole public life.

How often does a man have to prove his loyalty as an American, not by the constructive work that he does, but by the angry denunciation in which he engages?

How often does a loyal American have to prove his loyalty by the number of attacks on him, in the Soviet or American Communist press?

One of the things that most instantly repels Americans is, when they read in the original, or in translation, the kind of thing that is published in the Soviet press, where every issue of a magazine has to begin

with an adulation of Stalin, and denunciation of American imperialism, without any proof; where every individual article has to begin with an adulation of Stalin and denunciation of bourgeois cosmopolitanism, and jargon of this kind, Mr. Senator, to reach a point in American life where a university professor can only hold his chair if he is able to produce, from time to time, printed evidence that he has been attacked in the Soviet or Communist press, not longer ago than, say, 6 months?

If we get to that stage, Mr. Senator, McCarthyism will have dominated this country.

Senator TYDINGS. It will be filed in the record as exhibit 88.

Senator HICKENLOOPER?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, on yesterday you dwelt at some length upon the freedom of research and the danger to this country in curtailing that freedom. You advocated strongly the right of scholars, researchers, and others to examine the truth, to probe deeply to get to the truth, and the facts, whatever the facts are.

Again this morning you have defended that philosophy, and I am not in disagreement with you on that idea that the scholars and researchers must search for the truth, if we expect to progress; but, by the same token, this committee has a responsibility in the public political interest to search for the truth and to probe deeply for truth.

Now, do I understand that you are raising objection here now to this committee probing deeply and searchingly for the truth in this matter?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am not raising any objection at all to the committee probing as widely as it sees fit. I am here before this committee, not only in person, but as a representative of a whole group in our public life. I have referred to the trend of certain questions which I thought represented the reflection in this country of a type of denunciatory procedure which exists in Russia, and which I and other Americans do not like.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Well, Dr. Lattimore, the denomination by you of this proceeding as "McCarthyism" in my judgment is not exactly appropriate, and I say that without meaning to be caustic about any—

Dr. LATTIMORE. I am merely saying that the shadow of McCarthy has been projected over this committee. He denounced this committee over on the floor of the Senate—

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The shadow of Senator McCarthy may be projected over this committee, but the shadow of communistic activities in this country has been projected over this committee, and if you will read the statement of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover of yesterday I think that it will indicate that the Communist activities in this country are something for substantial concern, indeed; and, I shall be further interested in his statement of yesterday at a later date.

Dr. LATTIMORE. The question of communism in this country, as far as it affects me, Mr. Senator, has been introduced by false accusations, not by activities or writings.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Well, it is true that Senator McCarthy has been prominently connected with this proceeding. Without doubt, some of his charges generated the setting up of this committee. I think that goes without saying. That is true. But this committee

faces, as I understand it, as I approach it, a fact, and not necessarily a theory, and the fact that the committee faces—or facts—are the necessity for probing for truth, once this matter has been opened up.

Now, you have become an element in this inquiry. As such an element, I feel that it is the duty of this committee to ask questions, to probe deeply, and to find out from the answers to the questions that are asked, and information that is received, to find out a basis for fair and decent conclusions.

Dr. LATTIMORE. Equally, Senator, I feel it is my duty to appear before this committee. I would respectfully point out, however, that my case has been before this committee for more than a month, in the course of which I have not been able to attend to my ordinary vocation, in the slightest. I have put more than a month of time at the full disposal of this committee.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, the question I asked you, the question about whether or not Mrs. Lattimore had lectured to the Tom Mooney Labor School at San Francisco in 1943, and produced a tear sheet from the People's World, dated April 28, 1943, published in San Francisco, I believe, and in connection with that I find—I want to ask you whether or not, overnight, you and Mrs. Lattimore have had opportunity to refresh your recollection as to whether or not she actually did lecture at that time and place, to the Tom Mooney School?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes, Senator. We discussed it. First, I should like to say that during 1943, we were at the height of our war effort, and my wife and I, as people who had spent a great many years in China, were requested to speak all over the place, to all kinds of organizations, and we did so; and, as the printed record shows, both from a book that I published in 1943 and from a book that my wife and I together wrote in 1943 and published in 1944, we were both at that time heart and soul behind the Chinese war effort, as well as our war effort, and were strongly in favor of Chiang Kai-shek; so that all the lectures we gave at that time included strong support of Chiang Kai-shek.

My wife recalls that she spoke at what she understood to be a labor school, as both of us spoke at many schools, churches, community organizations and so forth, at various times; and with all due respect, Senator, I should like to add at this point that I think that this attack on me has set a new low in American political life, and I consider that this attempt to attack me through the activities of my wife, as a loyal American citizen, giving her opinions to no matter whoever it may be—her opinions, not the opinions of anyone else, strikes a new low.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I assure you, Dr. Lattimore, that I am merely attempting to probe the historic attitude toward communism, and I think some of these things are extremely pertinent, in putting the pattern together.

Dr. LATTIMORE. In putting the pattern together, is it a question of the audience to whom one speaks, or the words which one says?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. So far as the Tom Mooney Labor School is concerned, I have checked up on it, and I find the following reference, from the California Committee on un-American Activities. The first Tom Mooney Labor School was first announced in the People's World, July 1, 1942, that being the west coast organ of the Com-

unist Party. The California Committee on Un-American Activities further, in its report for 1947, said, and I quote as follows:

The San Francisco Workers' School \* \* \* frankly and openly a school for instruction in communism \* \* \* by 1943 \* \* \* had been rechristened the Tom Mooney Labor School. \* \* \* A glance at the curriculum reveals that changing the name of the San Francisco Workers' School to the Tom Mooney Labor School did not result in any deviation from the Marxist character of the institution \* \* \* the Tom Mooney Labor School functioned for years with Communist Party functionaries as instructors.

The reference is the California Un-American Activities report, for 1947, pages 63, 77, and 78.

Dr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Senator, in 1943 my wife and I were engaged in patriotic activity. We were not professional discoverers of subversive institutions. As far as my wife can recall, she remembers that she was asked to go down to a trade-union school. She spoke there, expressing the same ideas that she and I expressed everywhere else, and if now, some years later, it turns out that the Communists at that time were against Chiang Kai-Shek, and if it turns out now that my wife and I discover what we did not know before, that that particular school had Communist connections, well, I think that it is an extremely good thing that they were exposed at that time to some extremely un-Communist and anti-Communist remarks on, and interpretations of the situation in China.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, on yesterday I asked you a question as to whether or not a man by the name of Loomis ever arranged to furnish information supplied by you to Moscow, and in the Soviet diplomatic pouch. Your answer was "No."

Dr. LATTIMORE. I, to the best of my knowledge—the only man by the name of Loomis, of whom I knew in those years, was a former YMCA secretary in Hawaii, who was at that time the secretary of the Hawaii branch of the Institute of Pacific Relations and as anti-Communist a man as I know, and I certainly never stuffed anybody's pouches with information for the Soviet Union.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And, you did not at any time use the Soviet diplomatic pouch for the transmission of communications of any kind?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I may have used it on one occasion, in 1947, when I was hoping to be able to make a trip to Outer Mongolia. At that time, I knew that Americans were not being admitted to Outer Mongolia, and I thought it would be a considerable score if I could get there, so I wrote a letter to the Premier of Outer Mongolia, using the same technique that is used by correspondents in Moscow when they write a letter to Stalin, hoping to get a publishable answer, since the United States has no diplomatic connection with Outer Mongolia. I enclosed an original letter written in Mongol, with an English translation, and sent it to the Soviet Ambassador here in Washington, and asked him—and the enclosure was unsealed, and I asked him if he would transmit this request to the Soviet, to the Mongol Embassy in Moscow, asking him to transmit it to the Premier of Outer Mongolia.

Whether they sent it in any pouch or by written mail, I do not know. My request was all in writing. There was no conversation, and there was no answer.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And did you at any other time, and under any other circumstances ever make use of the Soviet diplomatic pouch for the transmission of any communications?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can possibly recall, Senator; and, I think it most unlikely. I cannot imagine the circumstances under which I might have used the Soviet pouch.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Well, then—

Senator McMAHON. I want to just say that—have you a copy of that letter that Senator Hickenlooper just asked you about?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I must have, yes.

Senator McMAHON. Will you produce it?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Surely.

Senator McMAHON. I will take advantage now of saying, for the record, that I have to preside over a meeting of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee at 10:30. We are having a very, very important session with Dr. Page, the physicist, and I have to go.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, what methods and means did you take for making your arrangements and the contacts for your trip to Yenan in, I believe, 1936 or 1937?

Senator TYDINGS. Excuse me.

Due to the absence of some of the members of the committee here, it will not be feasible to sit beyond 11:15, which is 40 minutes from now. I, myself, have to go downtown to keep an engagement of 2 months' standing which I have tried to get out of, and cannot, and, at 12:15 a speech; and Senator McMahon has this meeting and I am wondering what the situation will be in that regard.

Senator Green, could you preside up to 12:15 here, because we are meeting at 11—that would take care of it. We could go on for that length of time.

Senator GREEN. They want us all present.

Senator TYDINGS. Can you be here up to 12:15? I have to go.

Senator GREEN. I received this call from Senator Lucas to be in the Senate at 11.

Senator TYDINGS. What is your answer?

Senator GREEN. No.

Senator TYDINGS. I would stay myself, even in spite of the call, but I cannot stay on account of the engagement of a few months' standing, to speak to the Washington Rotary Club. Visitors from all over the country will be there at 12:15, and I have to leave before that to arrange for some other matters.

If you could sit here until 12:15, and then you could recess, it would relieve me; otherwise, there won't be anybody here.

Just a minute, we will get this all straightened out.

I would like for the hearing to go on, if you could stay here.

Senator GREEN. I would, but the majority leader telephoned and asked me to present there at 11 o'clock.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, the two Republican members might arrange to go on with the hearing, if the Democrats have to be gone.

Senator TYDINGS. Some of us have tried to be here at all times. We have always tried to have one of each party present while the committee was proceeding.

Senator GREEN. It seems to me it will be better if, when it comes 11 o'clock, we would adjourn—



Senator TYDINGS. We will have to do that. I had no idea yesterday that we were meeting at 11 this morning. The usual time for a meeting is at 12, so I had planned to go to 12:15. Go ahead. We will have to recess at 11 and meet again this afternoon.

Sorry to have to do this. Senator HICKENLOOPER. I withdraw that question. Just disregard the question I had asked which has not yet been answered.

Dr. Lattimore, will you tell the circumstances of whom you contacted and who arranged for your trip to Yen-an, that you testified about?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I was the man who managed the trip, Senator. We went by train, as far as we could go by train; then, we chartered a motorcar and drove on, and our first contact with Communists was at the first Communist post we encountered in the territory held by them.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did you have arrangement made to go on through, through that territory?

Dr. LATTIMORE. None.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You went without any previous authorization?

Dr. LATTIMORE. None.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. None whatever?

Dr. LATTIMORE. None whatever.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. So that you did not have the arrangements for this trip made in advance by any other persons?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe you said Mr. Jaffe and Mr. Bisson accompanied you on that trip?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is right, Senator.

I might add, Senator, that at that time every newspaperman in China was trying to get to Yen-an. The press, all over the world, was avid for news of that region, and it was known that anybody could get in who could get that far.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And, did the press, generally, get into Yen-an at that time?

Dr. LATTIMORE. A certain number got in, quite a number.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Was Agnes Smedley and Nym Wales at Yen-an when you reached there?

Dr. LATTIMORE. They were there when I arrived, yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And you conferred with them, there, I believe, at that time in Yen-an? That is, you met and talked to them there?

Dr. LATTIMORE. When we got there, we found that the Communists had a sort of resting house or hostel at which they put up all visitors, all foreign visitors. They were at that same hostel, and we saw them there.

We—at least, I can't speak for the others, but I had no conferences with them. I met them and talked with them socially.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Have you ever read the sort of story as developed by the Far Eastern Command?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I have seen references to it, Senator. I don't think I read it in detail.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You are aware that Agnes Smedley was listed as one of the agents that worked in connection with Sorge—

Dr. LATTIMORE. I am aware of that. I also remember a press story in which she vigorously denied it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Lattimore, what connection did you have with the Pacific Story, and the National Broadcasting Co. transcript, presented by the OWI? Did you write it or collaborate in its preparation?

Dr. LATTIMORE. The Pacific Story was a radio series of the type that is called radio drama. I was approached by NBC in 1943 and asked if I would act as commentator, coming on for a 3- or 4-minute period at the end of each broadcast, and for a number of the broadcasts my wife was asked to act as research worker, to dig out material for the man who did the program.

The program itself, as written, dramatized and presented on the air, was entirely the responsibility of the producer and of NBC. I was responsible for the commentary which I added at the end.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did Agnes Smedley broadcast in The Pacific Story?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Not that I ever heard of, not while I was on it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did you ever arrange for Miss Smedley to broadcast or take part in the broadcasting or preparation of The Pacific Story?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. I was on that Pacific Story program for about 3 months, as I recall. I did not arrange for it to be rebroadcast by OWI and, in fact, I believe that any time when I was working on it, I cannot recall that it was rebroadcast by OWI, and I did not arrange for anybody else to appear on it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do I understand you to say that Agnes Smedley did not appear on the program while you were taking part in it?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall. The program went on for some time after I left California.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Are you familiar with the organization called Indusco?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Were you ever an official of that organization?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I may have been one of the executive committee at one time, before I left for China in 1941.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Were you, in fact, an honorary vice chairman of the organization?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I may have been and, also, while I was in China, I talked a number of times about Indusco with the man who was then Premier of China, H. H. Chung, who was the chairman of the Chinese side of the organization.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And was Philip Jaffe on the board of directors?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Was Mrs. Lattimore on the board of directors with you?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Yes—

Mrs. LATTIMORE. Yes, I still am.

Dr. LATTIMORE. She was and still is.

Perhaps I should add at this moment, Senator, that in the people who were active on Indusco, as far as I knew them, and the whole program as far as I had anything to do with it, it was a part of that whole general attitude in China that I so frequently referred to, as my attitude, namely, the development of reforms and progressive measures in China that would forestall the Communists by giving people a democratic state of their own, in a kind of China totally different from the kind of China the Communists were aiming at.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, may I diverge just a moment here?

I received a note on yesterday, received a note from Freda Utley, in which she said she had seven questions she would like to have pre-pounded to Mr. Lattimore. The information was that she had sent those questions to me, but the guard told her the questions had to be turned over to Mr. Morgan, and I never received the questions. Now, I am giving no carte blanche to ask any questions anybody asks me to, but that is not the point—I would like to see the seven questions, to see whether I want to pre-pound any of them to this witness or not.

(Mr. Morgan handed the questions of Miss Utley to Senator Hickenlooper.)

Senator TYDINGS. Is Mr. Bielaski in the room, Mr. Frank Bielaski? (No response.)

Senator TYDINGS. He does not seem to be here, but he sent a message to the chairman that—I don't know Mr. Bielaski—that he would like to be notified when he was likely to be called. That is something I cannot tell him, except that when we finish with this phase of the matter, it is the present intention of the chairman, if the committee approves, to call Mr. Bielaski today, if we can find time to do it.

If he has any friends here, I wish they would notify him.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe, Dr. Lattimore, that you testified as to your acquaintance, for some period of time, with the young Mr. Chi, who is the person proposed by the present Communist regime in China as their representative to the United Nations?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is correct, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You have known him for a number of years?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I have known him for a number of years.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did you know him before the war?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I knew him before the war. I think I must have met him first about 1934. I knew him rather slightly in those years, except that I remember that he helped me, by checking some of my translations from Chinese sources at one time, Chinese historical sources; but the time at which I knew him best was during the war, in Chungking, when I was adviser to the generalissimo, and he stood in a confidential relationship to Mr. H. H. Chung, who was then the Premier.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. During your acquaintance with Mr. Chi, prior to the war or during the war, did you believe him to be or did you learn him to be a Communist at any time?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; no, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. When did you first know that he was, in fact, a Communist?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I do not know that he is, in fact, a Communist now, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Is there any doubt in your mind that he would be here as the proposed representative of Communist China to the United Nations, if he is not a Communist?

Dr. LATTIMORE. It is possible, Senator. The Communist government in China appears to have taken over the services of a considerable number of non-Communists, especially where they were men of specialized training of various kinds.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You have known Mr. Frederick V. Field for a number of years?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Since 1934; in the summer of 1933 I met him at a conference of the institute.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And you have associated with him in the Institute of Pacific Relations and in the earlier days of Amcrasia; is that correct?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I was associated with Mr. Field to the extent that we were both employed by the Institute of Pacific Relations since 1934.

He, however, was associated with the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and I was associated with Pacific Affairs, which was the organ of the International Organization of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

During the earlier years of that association I was living principally in China.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. During that association, did you believe at any time, or were you reliably informed by Mr. Field—I will put it specifically—by Mr. Field, on information, that Mr. Field was either a Communist or had vigorous Communist sympathies?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. Quite the contrary. As far as I knew, Mr. Field was a man who had an interest in the economies of the Pacific region, and who was a rather liberal young man, but my acquaintance with him, my discussion of political topics with him, was so casual that it was not even—not until the other day did I even learn that he had at one time been a supporter of Mr. Norman Thomas. At that time I didn't know it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. During all of your associations with Philip Jaffe did you at any time come to believe, or were you at any time reliably informed, as to whether or not Mr. Jaffe either was or is either a Communist or a strong Communist sympathizer?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. In my contacts with Mr. Jaffe, which were extremely slight, I went on this one trip with him to Yenan, and after I came back to the United States, at the very end of 1937, enroute to Baltimore in the fall of 1938, I saw him rather occasionally. I was not an active—I was not very active on the advisory board of Amerasia, and my opinion of Mr. Jaffe, chiefly from talking to him on the journey to Yenan, which was the closest association I ever had with him, was that he was one of those Americans who had a very bright and open view of the democratic nature of the Communists in China, but I had no reason to believe that he was, himself, a Communist.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. As a result of your association and acquaintance with Agnes Smedley, did you at any time conclude, or were you at any time reliably informed that Agnes Smedley either was a Communist, or had strong Communist sympathies?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. My acquaintance with Agnes Smedley, which has never been a very close acquaintance, consisted in meeting here on a few occasions, at long intervals and would convince me, from such of her conversations that I have heard, that she is not and never could be a Communist. She is a person of very strong opinions, and as far as my experience with her goes, she is not a person who would submit her ideas or her conduct to anybody's control.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. During your association and acquaintance with, and knowledge of Nym Wales, did you at any time believe, or were you at any time reliably informed as to whether or not Nym Wales was a Communist, or strongly sympathetic toward the Communists?

Dr. LATTIMORE. My acquaintance with Nym Wales is even slighter than my acquaintance with Agnes Smedley. I knew her slightly when she and her then husband, Mr. Edgar Snow, were living in Peking. I saw her again when I was up at Yen-an. From what I have heard of her conversations, and from what I have read of hers, and I confess I have not read very much that she has written, I have no reason to believe that she is or was a Communist.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now, during your acquaintance with and knowledge of T. A. Bisson, did you have reason to believe, or were you reliably informed as to whether or not Mr. Bisson was either a Communist or had strong Communist leanings?

Dr. LATTIMORE. None whatever, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Had these people, or any of them become known to you as either Communist, or people with strong Communist leanings—had that happened, would your actions and conduct with them been different than it was, in your associations?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is a hypothetical question, Senator?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I realize that it is.

Dr. LATTIMORE. I think it can best be answered by pointing out that during those years, and to this day I have been extremely little influenced by—I say this with all due respect to them—people like Agnes Smedley or Nym Wales or T. A. Bisson; because all of these are people who have lived in China less than I have; who either do not speak or read Chinese at all, or do not speak it or read it as well as I do, so that they are not people to whom I would go, either for material information, or for guidance of ideas, because I have always worked directly with original sources.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe on page 914 of your statement—I don't know whether the page number is correct or not—I believe you made a statement in which you said that during the war you consulted with a Chinese, Chou En Lai; I don't know how to pronounce it but it is spelled C-h-o-u E-n L-a-i. He was a Communist leader; was he not?

Dr. LATTIMORE. He was the official Communist representative in Chungking when I was there with the generalissimo, and I met him on instructions from the generalissimo.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Therefore, I take it that you reported in detail the results of your conversations with him to the generalissimo?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Naturally.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe that you stated previously that Lauchlin Currie had advised you that he had recommended you to the President, and the President had selected you for recommendation as an adviser to Chiang Kai-shek; is that right?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. I was asked to come over to Washington, to speak with Mr. Currie, who told me that the generalissimo had asked President Roosevelt to recommend an adviser to him. I don't know how my name came up, but I certainly did not understand that I was being recommended to the President by Mr. Currie. What I understood was that Mr. Currie, as an executive assistant to the President, had been instructed to call me in for an interview to see whether I was willing to consider such an appointment, before I saw Mr. Roosevelt.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. How long and how well had you known Mr. Lauchlin Currie before that time?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Before that time, I had never heard of him. I had never met him or even heard of him, except as his name appeared in the press, as a man who had made a journey to China, on behalf of the President.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. After your tour of duty as adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, did you submit a report to any person in this Government as to your activities?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Of the affairs there during that period?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. I was not responsible to this Government, and there was no requirement for me to make any report to this Government. I was solely in the service of the generalissimo.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I understand that. I was inquiring as to whether in fact such a report had been filed.

Did you file a report with anybody in the Government after you returned from your trip with Vice President Wallace?

Dr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall, Senator.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Were you designated to accompany him on that trip by some authority?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I was.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. What was the designating authority?

Dr. LATTIMORE. The Office of War Information, to which I belonged, as far as I recall.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And did you not file a report with the Office of War Information on that trip?

Dr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall that I did. That could easily be checked.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did you file any official report, or a report with any public officials, Government officials at the conclusion of the Pawley Reparations Commission?

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. Like other members of that Commission, I participated in the gathering of pertinent material and the drafting of Mr. Pawley's report. Mr. Pawley's report was Mr. Pawley's report, and I was not required to make any report as an individual.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In connection with your trip with Mr. Wallace, you are familiar with his book, Soviet Asia Mission, are you not?

Dr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You are familiar, therefore, I presume, with the credit which he gives in the first part of this book, under the heading "Author's note" in which he says:

In acknowledgement of invaluable assistance in preparing the manuscript of Soviet Asia Mission, my sincere thanks are extended to: John Hazard, Owen

PART II

**STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION**

---

---

**HEARINGS**

BEFORE A

**SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

**UNITED STATES SENATE**

**EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS**

**SECOND SESSION**

PURSUANT TO

**S. Res. 231**

**A RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER THERE ARE  
EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT  
DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES**

---

**PART 2**

**APPENDIX**

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1950

08970



STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

---

---

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

PURSUANT TO

**S. Res. 231**

A RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER THERE ARE  
EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT  
DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES

---

PART 2

APPENDIX

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

TOM CONNALLY, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia      ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan  
ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah      ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin  
MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland      H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey  
CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida      BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa  
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island      HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts  
BRIEN McMAHON, Connecticut  
J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*

C. C. O'DAY, *Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SENATE RESOLUTION 231

MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland, *Chairman*

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island      BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa  
BRIEN McMAHON, Connecticut      HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts

EDWARD P. MORGAN, *Chief Counsel*

ROBERT L. HEALD, *Assistant Counsel*      LYON L. TYLER, Jr., *Assistant Counsel*

WILLIAM J. KLIMA, *Assistant Counsel*      ROBERT MORRIS, *Assistant Counsel*

MARGARET B. BUCHHOLZ, *Subcommittee Clerk*

listed the problems which might confront us if there were any landings of the coast of China, of being in a position to use whatever forces we found organized and able to give us effective support.

Senator McMAHON. What was, if you know, General Wedemeyer's position in this controversy?

Mr. SERVICE. I do not know. He was interested in having our statement of the problem.

Senator McMAHON. In military developments what policy was chosen?

Mr. SERVICE. I also do not know what policy was finally chosen. There never were any landings, and the situation actually never arose.

Senator McMAHON. That is what I wanted to get in the record. My memory was sure that the problem never arose because there were no landings, but I wanted to make sure that on the record that was stated, because I thought possibly there might have been some brief skirmishes which I did not remember.

Mr. SERVICE. I do not know what the final policy was, or whether any final policy was adopted.

Mr. MORGAN. Incident to my contemplated interrogation with respect to this conversation between Mr. Service and Jaffe, I believe a great many of the questions which I had in mind have already been discussed. However, since Mr. McInerney is here, and in order that our record may be somewhat complete on this matter, can you indicate for our record, Mr. McInerney, as to how long the transcript of this conversation has been made available to you, or how long it has been available to you in the Department of Justice?

Mr. McINERNEY. That transcript which you have before you was made available to us last week, I believe on June 21, and it was made available to us pursuant to your request for it.

Mr. MORGAN. What I want to know, Mr. McInerney, if you can help me, is whether you and Mr. Hitchcock at the time of the handling of this matter from a prosecuting standpoint in 1945 were cognizant of this conversation?

Mr. McINERNEY. This conversation was contained in the summarization and contained in an FBI report dated approximately June 1, 1945.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the summarization accurately reflect the substance of this conversation?

Mr. McINERNEY. I would say generally, yes. It is incomplete, but speaking generally I would say so.

Mr. MORGAN. Did it indicate to you, on the basis of the summary which we do not have before us, that Mr. Service had said he had passed on military plans to Mr. Jaffe?

Senator GREEN. That does not appear in the transcript, either.

Mr. MORGAN. The statement to which I am referring, Senator, is the one we have been referring to this morning, in which Mr. Service purportedly said, "What I said about the military plans is, of course, very secret."

Mr. McINERNEY. I would say in response to your question that it contained no more than the transcript you have before you, and perhaps a little less, because it was a summarization.

Mr. MORGAN. Thank you.

Senator McMAHON. Did you know when you received this advice in 1945 that this was secured by an intercept?

Mr. McINERNEY. From the face of the report it was described as coming from a confidential informant.

Senator McMAHON. It was the choice of that and that they had somebody under one of the desks?

Mr. McINERNEY. You could speculate along those lines, although I must admit that I knew from my experience that such was not the case.

Senator McMAHON. I think that was a fair deduction from the physical set-up, that it was probably by wire instead of by eavesdropping.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. McInerney, if there had been a direct microphone in the apartment, a direct microphone intercept, would you have proceeded to consider that as evidence admissible in court?

Mr. McINERNEY. Apart from its inadmissibility, it had been received by us with the caveat which was read by the chairman at the commencement of the session here.

Mr. MORRIS. Who wrote the caveat?

Mr. McINERNEY. The FBI. It is the FBI caveat.

That is from the FBI memorandum of May 29, 1945, introducing the case to us.

Mr. MORGAN. Is that the caveat reading,

Most of the foregoing information regarding the contacts made by the various principals and the documents which were exchanged were obtained through highly confidential means and sources of information which cannot be used in evidence.

Mr. McINERNEY. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Is that an FBI or Justice Department caveat?

Mr. McINERNEY. That is an FBI caveat.

Senator GREEN. Does that end that line of questioning?

Mr. MORGAN. I believe so.

Senator GREEN. It is 1 o'clock. I believe we had better take a recess until half past 2.

(Whereupon, at 1 p. m., a recess was taken to reconvene at 2:30 p. m. of the same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

(The hearing was resumed at 2:45 p. m., Senator Green, acting chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.)

Senator GREEN. I think we had better proceed, Mr. Morgan. Have you any further questions?

Mr. MORGAN. I think, Mr. Chairman, at the last session I had directed a few questions to Mr. McInerney, and I would like to ask him this general question with respect to this transcript of the conversation, as to whether the method in which that transcript was obtained had any bearing upon the handling of Mr. Service's case from the prosecutive standpoint.

Mr. McINERNEY. I would say—

Senator GREEN. I think if you came over here and sat down at the foot of the table, it would be better.

Mr. McINERNEY. I would say that it did not, since this transcript was not available to us from an evidentiary standpoint, and we reviewed it solely from the standpoint of background material.

Since it could not be used before the grand jury or otherwise, I would say that it did not have any bearing on the prosecution in this case with respect to Mr. Service.

Mr. MORGAN. I believe those are the only questions that I have to direct to Mr. McInerney, and the only questions that I have for the moment I have asked Mr. Service already, so the questioning, Mr. Chairman, you can turn over to somebody else.

Senator GREEN. Senator Lodge?

Senator LODGE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I understand that there were six FBI reports about Mr. Service dated December 28, 1948, February 10, 1949, March 10, 1949, April 4, 1949, August 9, 1949, September 7, 1949, and September 21, 1949.

I wonder if we could have copies of those reports, Mr. McInerney?

Mr. McINERNEY. I would have to take that up with Mr. Ford, Senator. I would assume that they would not be available, sir.

Senator LODGE. Well, I would like to make a motion, Mr. Chairman, that we request that those FBI reports about Mr. Service be made available because they are obviously extremely pertinent to this whole matter in contemplation.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator LODGE. I have made a motion which I would like to have the chairman put.

Senator GREEN. There are only two of us here, and I do not know whether we can act.

Senator LODGE. Would you object to getting those?

Senator GREEN. No, I would be glad to join Senator Lodge in his request, but I think we would have to leave it for the others of the committee also.

Senator LODGE. Did you want to make an observation, Mr. McInerney?

Mr. McINERNEY. I was going to ask whether Mr. Service's loyalty file is included.

Senator LODGE. I do not know.

Mr. McINERNEY. I wonder if you have had access to those reports.

Senator LODGE. I will have to ask Mr. Morgan the question.

Mr. MORGAN. Whether Mr. Service's files is among the 81?

Senator LODGE. Whether it is among the 81.

Mr. MORGAN. That were examined by the committee at the White House? Probably not. I would have to check. As I recall the list of 81 names, Mr. Service's name was not on it.

Senator LODGE. Have you not read all of the 81 files yourself?

Mr. MORGAN. I have not read one of them, Senator.

Senator GREEN. They have not been available to him.

Senator LODGE. I would like to ask Mr. Service to tell the committee the time and place of his meeting with Lauchlin Currie in 1945.

Mr. SERVICE. That is a difficult question—

Senator LODGE. What is that?

Mr. SERVICE. That is a difficult question to answer in detail because I am not sure how many times I saw him, but I have no recollection of meeting him in 1945 at any place other than at his office.

Senator LODGE. In what city?

Mr. SERVICE. In Washington, D. C. His office was in the old State Department Building.

Senator LODGE. How many times did you see him?

Mr. SERVICE. I am sorry, I am not sure whether it would be two or three times, perhaps.

Senator LODGE. What did Mr. Currie tell you?

Mr. SERVICE. It is extremely difficult after all this lapse of time to remember these events in any particular detail.

Senator LODGE. Well, if there are important events, you certainly ought to be able to remember the gist of them.

Mr. SERVICE. I have an idea that the first time I saw him was probably fairly soon after I arrived back here in April, and that would be just general conversation, the situation in China, and he probably told me something about what he was doing, but I think he was working on German assets in Switzerland.

Senator LODGE. Did he not ever give you any assignments?

Mr. SERVICE. Not in 1945, sir.

Senator LODGE. At any time did he give you any assignments?

Mr. SERVICE. I am not sure what you mean by "assignments," did he—

Senator LODGE. Did he give you instructions, tell you things that he wanted you to do?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, at one time in 1943, I think it was, he expressed a hope that I would be able to write letters to him occasionally, write directly to him.

Senator LODGE. Did he never tell you to go to any particular place?

Mr. SERVICE. No, sir; I do not recall his ever telling me to go to any particular place?

Senator LODGE. Did he tell you to go to see any particular person? (Mr. Service confers with counsel.)

Mr. SERVICE. On one occasion he asked me to talk to Drew Pearson.

Senator LODGE. With what purpose?

Mr. SERVICE. Just to give Mr. Pearson some background information.

Senator LODGE. Is that the only person that he ever asked you to talk to?

Mr. SERVICE. No, 1945 there was a question of whom I should retain for my counsel, and he suggested that I talk to Mr. Corcoran as being a person who might be a good person to advise me on the question.

Senator LODGE. You saw him after the Amerasia case broke?

Mr. SERVICE. That was after the Amerasia case.

Senator LODGE. Did you go to see him to get advice?

Mr. SERVICE. Mr. Currie?

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Mr. SERVICE. Yes, I went to him to talk to him about it, see what his advice was. I was talking to a great many people I knew then, and almost everybody had different advice on this question of counsel whom I should retain.

Senator LODGE. And you sought him out to get his advice, is that right?

Mr. SERVICE. That is correct, sir.

Senator LODGE. What did he say that he could do for you?

Mr. SERVICE. He did not say that he could do anything for me. He suggested that I talk to Mr. Corcoran.

Senator LODGE. Did Mr. Currie ever do anything for you?

Mr. SERVICE. Not that I know of, except to suggest that Mr. Corcoran would be a person who would be able to advise me on this problem of counsel. Mr. Corcoran advised me to retain the counsel whom I had already provisionally retained, Mr. Munter.

Senator LODGE. Where is Mr. Currie now, do you know?

Mr. SERVICE. He has been employed, I think, with the World Bank. I am not sure whether he is still in Washington or not.

I saw in the newspapers, I think, that he had accepted some appointment to go to some South American country, perhaps Colombia.

Senator LODGE. Reading through this testimony, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there are five persons whose names appear, and who may have something of value to tell this committee about the Amerasia case, Mr. Bannerman, Mr. Braunlicht, Mr. Hartfield, Mr. Geiger, and Mr. Currie, and I suggest that they be called for questioning.

Mr. MORRIS. Who is Mr. Geiger, Senator?

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator LODGE. I have just been reading through the testimony which was taken while I was away. I would add the name of Mr. Currie who was considered by some people to know a good deal about this subject.

Senator GREEN. Mr. Morgan, do you wish to say something?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Bannerman, Mr. Hartfield, Mr. Currie, Mr. Braunlicht—his name appears in the testimony.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, but not in connection with Amerasia.

Senator LODGE. It does not?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think that is true with respect to Mr. Geiger. I do not believe our record has anything about him concerning Amerasia. Geiger, as I understand it, has been or is an employee of ECA.

Senator LODGE. I know, but I thought he had a connection with this case.

Mr. MORGAN. Not to my knowledge.

Senator LODGE. If he has no connection—I thought the evidence indicated that he did have a connection with this case, but if he has not, then I do not want to call him.

Senator GREEN. So the three names are?

Senator LODGE. Bannerman, Hartfield, and Currie; and if Geiger and Braunlicht have no connection with the Amerasia case, then I do not want to bother to call them.

Mr. McINERNEY. Mr. Chairman, if you are through with the discussion of the record, which I came here to be helpful on and in answering any questions concerning it, if the questioning with regard to that record is complete, why, I can leave, since it would appear as if you are going into other matters.

Senator GREEN. Have you any further questions? Are there any further questions of Mr. McInerney?

Senator LODGE. I have some questions here about this Amerasia case. I have got a question I would like to ask Mr. McInerney.

Testifying on May 4, before this subcommittee, Mr. McInerney said with reference to the documents found in the offices of the Amerasia magazine, and I quote—I am making a partial quotation:

I would say with respect to all these documents that they were of an innocuous, very innocuous character. These things impressed me as being a little above the level of teacup gossip. Classification of documents in this case was nothing short of silly.

Now, the question presents itself to me, by what right and with what justification does the Department of Justice presume to pass on whether a document is properly or improperly classified by some other agency or department of the Government?

Mr. McINERNEY. I would say that generally speaking the classification of a document of another agency is not the business of the Department of Justice, and I think, perhaps, what I was trying to say there was to indicate the relationship between those documents and the national defense as the words "national defense" are used in the espionage statutes; and under the law, the relationship between a particular document and the national defense is a question of fact for a jurymen to decide, and it is not a question of fact or of law for the agency to decide, and I believe I illustrated my point at that time by alluding to the trial at Hartford of Draper and Adler, in which I said that the judge at that trial refused to accept the designation of the Attorney General as to an organization's being subversive or not subversive; so it was in that light against that background that I made that statement, sir.

Senator LODGE. Well, do you think that the Department of Justice personnel are sufficiently trained in making decisions regarding the importance of military matters to be able to say whether a military document is properly classified or not?

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not believe so, sir.

Senator LODGE. Is it not true that a document to a person who has no military training may appear silly, but to a person who has military training it is not so silly at all; is that not true?

Mr. McINERNEY. Yes, sir.

Senator LODGE. I have nothing more from Mr. McInerney.

Senator GREEN. Then you may be excused unless Mr. Morgan or Mr. Morris have any questions.

Be mindful of that request that we have made, and let us know the reply.

Mr. McINERNEY. About the records, sir.

Senator GREEN. Yes.

Mr. McINERNEY. Yes, sir.

(Mr. McInerney withdrew from the room.)

Senator GREEN. Are you ready, Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. Is it my turn now?

May I just pursue the line of questioning that Senator Lodge instituted there?

Did you go to see Mr. Corcoran after Lauchlin Currie had recommended it?

Mr. SERVICE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. What did he say?

Mr. SERVICE. He recommended that I retain the lawyer I had already provisionally retained.

Mr. MORRIS. Did he give you any other advice?

Mr. SERVICE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Was there anybody in addition to Mr. Corcoran that Mr. Currie asked you to go to see? There were some others, were there not? Did you go to see David Niles in this connection?

Mr. SERVICE. No; never have met David Niles, so far as I know.

Mr. MORRIS. I wish you would recall very carefully, Mr. Service. Did you go to see anybody else in this connection?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, I went to see and talked to a great many people.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you tell us who some of them were?



Mr. SERVICE: Friends of mine. I talked to Ambassador Gauss who was an old friend of mine, my former chief. I talked to most of my associates.

Mr. MORRIS: Did you speak to Owen Lattimore about it?

Mr. SERVICE: I don't recall seeing Owen Lattimore after my arrest at all. No; I don't recall speaking to Mr. Owen Lattimore about it.

Mr. MORRIS: Could you tell us some of the other friends of yours whom you discussed the matter with, particularly Government officials?

Mr. SERVICE: That is a very difficult question. All of my friends were interested in my situation. They were interested in knowing whether or not they could help me; interested in knowing what my situation was; almost everybody asked me something about the case.

Mr. MORRIS: Whom did you seek out?

Mr. SERVICE: Well, I talked to Judge Helmick who used to be judge of the United States Court for China, and who was in Washington at that time.

I spoke to Mr. John Carter Vincent who was a man whom I worked under in China, and was at that time head of the Division of Chinese Affairs.

I talked briefly to Mr. Seldon Chapin, who was the Director of the Office of Foreign Service.

Mr. MORRIS: Anyone else?

Mr. SERVICE: Those are the principal ones.

As I say, it is hard to make an inclusive list of all of the people whom I talked to about the case.

Mr. MORRIS: Mr. Service, in open session the other day you testified that you did not recall the name of Anna Liese Wang.

Mr. SERVICE: Yes; I was going to raise that. We said we were going to raise that ourselves. I was thinking of it after you interrogated me the other day, and I recalled that I know a woman whom I had always thought of as Anna Wang, but I never knew her middle name. I always thought it was a German woman. She is married to a Chinese.

Mr. MORRIS: I see.

Mr. SERVICE: But she was out in China, and if she is a white woman, she always—

Mr. MORRIS: I did say she was Chinese.

Mr. SERVICE: But I do know an Anna Wang or did know Anna Wang.

Mr. MORRIS: Did you ever give her access to your file?

Mr. SERVICE: Certainly not, sir.

Mr. MORRIS: Certainly not?

Mr. SERVICE: Yes. What sort of file?

Mr. MORRIS: Well, the official records in your office.

Mr. SERVICE: No.

Mr. MORRIS: Was a complaint lodged against you on that score, Mr. Service?

Mr. SERVICE: Not that I have any recollection of.

Mr. MORRIS: Would you give the committee here just a brief outline of your association with Mrs. Wang; you know, just the extent of it?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, she was the wife of a Chinese named Wang Ping-nan, who was ostensibly the representative in Chungking of a Chinese general named Yang Hu-ching. It was known to us that Mr. Wang worked fairly closely with the Chinese Communists, and eventually some time subsequent to my departure from Chungking after the war, actually he came out openly as a member of the Chinese Communist representative's office.

Now, I had very little direct contact with Mrs. Wang. Mr. Wang was an intelligence source, and I had occasion to see him fairly frequently in my work.

Mrs. Wang was acting part time, I believe, as a sort of secretary to Madam Sun Yat-sen who, of course, is the widow of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the patriarch of the Chinese revolution, and the first leader of the Kuomintang.

Mr. MORRIS. She is not with the Chinese Communists?

Mr. SERVICE. I have no knowledge; I have not heard of her since I left China. I have not had anything to do with her since I left China over 5 years ago.

Mr. MORRIS. How freely did you discuss political matters with Mrs. Wang?

Mr. SERVICE. I don't think I discussed them with her at all. As I say, I had very little contact with her; it was incidental.

Mr. MORRIS. There are a couple of other names I want to ask you about in connection with the Amerasia case.

(Mr. Service consults with counsel.)

Mr. SERVICE. Well, I did have occasion once to report to G-2 that she seemed to be very friendly with some American enlisted men.

(Mr. Service confers with counsel.)

Mr. SERVICE. Well, the point is that as part of my work with headquarters I would advise—I was called in for consultation by G-2 occasionally on reputation and security risks of contact by our enlisted men with certain women in Chungking city. I had some occasion to report to G-2 that Mrs. Wang was, in my view, a poor person for some of our military staff to be contacting too closely, shall we say.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever discuss your difficulty in the Amerasia case with Ben Cohen?

Mr. SERVICE. After the whole case was finished, after I had thought it was finished, after the announcement of the grand jury decision, several days went by with no public announcement as to what action had been taken by the State Department in regard to my reinstatement or return to active duty.

I am not sure of the exact date, but it seems to me the grand jury's decision was announced on the 10th of August. At about the 13th or 14th—at any rate some days later—I think the Washington Post published a brief editorial raising the question, "What's happened to this man who had a no-true-bill returned against him? Has the Department of State reinstated him or not?"

So I went to Mr. Cohen, who was the counselor of the Department, and I showed him the editorial, and I asked him whether the Department of State expected to make any announcement since I had already, in fact, been reinstated, and it was fairly soon after that that some announcement was made, the letters being published from Secretary Byrnes and Under Secretary Grew. That is the only time in that period that I met Mr. Cohen, and the first time I had met him.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, now, when you met Mr. Corcoran, was Mr. Currie at the meeting?

Mr. SERVICE. I don't believe so; no, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you confer with the attorneys in the Department of Justice in this matter at all?

Mr. SERVICE. My counsel and I, Mr. Munter and I, called on Mr. McInerney in connection with my request to appear voluntarily before the grand jury. I believe that we talked to him only once.

Mr. MORRIS. You spoke with whom then?

Mr. SERVICE. Mr. McInerney.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ask to appear before the second grand jury, or did the second grand jury call you?

Mr. SERVICE. I don't remember having any knowledge at the time that there had been a first grand jury.

Mr. MORRIS. You appeared before only one grand jury?

Mr. SERVICE. Only before the second grand jury, and that was only at my request. I don't think that we knew that the first grand jury was meeting.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know before you appeared before the grand jury or did you have any reason to believe before you appeared before the grand jury, that you would not be indicted?

Mr. SERVICE. I was confident that I was innocent.

Mr. MORRIS. Did anyone assure you that you were?

Mr. SERVICE. I was confident in my own mind.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you receive any assurances other than from your own conviction?

Mr. SERVICE. Of course not; none whatsoever, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. And nobody intimated to you that you were going to be cleared?

Mr. SERVICE. No, sir. I don't see how anyone could.

Mr. MORRIS. Is it your testimony that you were not advised before you appeared before the grand jury that everything would be all right? I wish you would think very carefully on that.

Mr. SERVICE. That everything would be all right?

Mr. MORRIS. Think very carefully, Mr. Service, because it is an important question.

Mr. SERVICE. Who was supposed to have made such a statement?

Mr. MORRIS. I asked you the question.

Mr. SERVICE. I don't recall any such statement as that. Both my lawyer and Mr. Corcoran were extremely hesitant to allow me to appear. I suppose that lawyers naturally would hesitate to allow any person to waive immunity and appear. Mr. Munter finally agreed to allow me to appear.

Mr. MORRIS. Why did he change his mind, Mr. Service? Did Mr. Currie make any assurances to him or to you that you should appear?

Mr. SERVICE. No, sir. So far as I know he never talked to Mr. Currie.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Cohen?

Mr. SERVICE. I don't believe so.

Mr. MORRIS. Why did Mr. Munter change his mind, Mr. Service?

Mr. SERVICE. I assume because he was convinced that I was guilty, and therefore I would be all right—I am sorry, I was innocent, was not guilty, and would be all right. He told me to go ahead, and he thought it would be all right.

Mr. MORRIS. So it is your testimony that no one assured you that if you appeared before the grand jury you would come out all right?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, I have no recollection of anyone telling me that, and unless I know the context it is hard for me to answer. Somebody, Mr. Munter himself, may have said, "Well, I think you are all right, go ahead if you feel that you can take it, that you will be all right; why, all right, go ahead."

Mr. MORRIS. When did you first hear that you were cleared by the grand jury, Mr. Service?

Mr. SERVICE. I heard it from the press, as I remember it.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you not hear it before it was announced formally?

Mr. SERVICE. I can't recall how I did hear it now. It was the same day that it was announced.

Mr. MORRIS. It is not a fact that you knew it before the official return was made?

Mr. SERVICE. Not that I recall. Can you give me any information?

Mr. MORRIS. No, I am asking you the question, Mr. Service.

Mr. SERVICE. I cannot recall now whether my lawyer told me; but in any case, it was the same day that the announcement was made.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, Mr. Service, I think—I call your attention to the fact that here was a decision on the part of the grand jury that certainly must have meant a great deal to you and your life.

Mr. SERVICE. It certainly did.

Mr. MORRIS. So I think it is reasonable if we ask you to tell us how you first learned that news. It seems to me the kind of thing that you do not forget.

Mr. SERVICE. I am sorry, I simply have. There were a great many things happening to me at that time. So far as I can remember, I heard simultaneously with the public announcement on the same day that it was announced.

Now, whether I heard—I assume I must have heard through my lawyer's office. He may have received word, but I don't remember actually because I was very disappointed. It was the same day that it was announced that Japan was going to accept our surrender terms, and I thought, "This is a guy's tough luck; when he is arrested it is all over the front page, but when he is cleared on the day that it is announced that Japan is surrendering, he is lucky if it is going to be on page 27."

Mr. MORRIS. Is it your testimony, Mr. Service, that you do not recall how you first learned the decision of the grand jury that you had been cleared even though that fact was and should have been a very important decision in your life?

Mr. SERVICE. I regret that I have no specific recollection now of how I got the news. I may have gotten it through the State Department, I don't know.

Mr. MORRIS. Who is the one who was in charge of your defense fund, Mr. Service?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, as I said the other day, there was a small fund of \$500 raised by various friends.

Mr. MORRIS. Was there not one person in charge of collecting it?

Mr. SERVICE. There was one person who was not in charge, but simply acting as a treasurer. It was Dr. Mortimer Graves. That, of course, was only a small part of my expenditures. That simply cov-

ered the cost of my bond. I had to borrow considerable money from my family and other people.

Mr. MORRIS. Altogether what did your defense cost you, Mr. Service?

Mr. SERVICE. I think that the lawyer's fee was \$2,000, which he later reduced to \$1,500. I spent, I estimated, \$400 or \$500 in incidental expenses, and so on, and counting \$500 for a bond, that would be \$2,500.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you discuss the Amerasia case at all with Alger Hiss?

Mr. SERVICE. I beg your pardon?

Mr. MORRIS. Alger Hiss? Did you discuss the Amerasia case with him?

Mr. SERVICE. I never had any discussion with Alger Hiss.

Mr. MORRIS. Or Donald Hiss?

Mr. SERVICE. I never met him at all except on one occasion in January or February 1943.

Mr. MORRIS. What was that occasion, Mr. Service?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, at that time he was working, I think, as an assistant to Dr. Hornbeck, who was called special adviser on Far Eastern affairs, and while I was in the Department on consultation during January and February 1943 I was introduced to Mr. Hiss, as I was to everyone else in the Far Eastern set-up, and we had lunch together on one occasion.

Mr. MORRIS. That was in 1943 that you had lunch?

Mr. SERVICE. That was in early 1943.

Mr. MORRIS. How about Donald Hiss?

Mr. SERVICE. As far as I know I have never met Donald Hiss.

Mr. MORRIS. In your testimony, in your statement, Mr. Service, you quoted from Emmanuel Larsen's testimony before this committee. Where did you obtain a copy of this testimony?

Mr. SERVICE. You don't have the page, do you?

Mr. MORRIS. No, I don't know offhand, Mr. Service.

Mr. SERVICE. This is from my preliminary statement, which appears at page 1982 of the transcript of these hearings, and I quote:

Despite the sworn testimony which I have just quoted—

that is, the sworn testimony which I just quoted was from the hearings before the loyalty board—I continue with the quotation from the transcript of these hearings:

The news story in the Washington Star for June 20 referred to above indicates that Larsen repeated before your committee the following day the charge that I, among others, sought to "sabotage" Mr. Hurley.

I can try to find the Evening Star for you.

Mr. MORRIS. Is it your testimony that you had no information on Larsen's testimony other than what you read in the Washington Star?

Mr. SERVICE. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. You had access to no other testimony?

Mr. SERVICE. We had access to no other testimony, except the testimony that he gave in the loyalty hearing, my own loyalty hearing. We had no access that he had—no access to testimony that he had given before this committee.

Mr. MORRIS. That is from the loyalty board. All right.

In connection with your visit to the Lattimores 2 days prior to your arrest, Mr. Service, you testified that you were going over the manuscript of a book that had been written by Mr. Roth.

Mr. SERVICE. I don't think that I testified that I was going over it. I said that my recollection was that Mr. Roth had brought along the galley proofs, so far as the book he wanted to discuss with Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. MORRIS. I see, not with you?

Mr. SERVICE. No, I said that I don't recall ever having read the galley proofs myself; that I was not particularly interested in it. It was a book on Japan.

Mr. MORRIS. What was the name of the book, do you know?

Mr. SERVICE. It was finally published under the title, as I recall it, Dilemma in Japan.

Can I refer you, sir, to page 1322 of the transcript of hearing before this committee in which Mr. Morgan asked me: "Did you see the galley proofs of Mr. Roth's book yourself?"

I replied:

I have no recollection of ever seeing them or reading them. I was not particularly interested in Japan, and the book was entirely concerned with Japan. I had no specialized knowledge or interest.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Service, I notice that very often after you would render a report to your superiors you would frequently request that a copy be sent to John Davies. Why did you do that?

Mr. SERVICE. There were four Foreign Service officers attached to the China-Burma-India theater as political officers. The senior among the four was Mr. Davies, who had come to China with General Stilwell when he took over command or rather when he established the theater in the beginning of 1942.

Mr. Davies acted really as the senior, and as he was the director of this group of four officers, it was our established policy, with the approval of Army Headquarters, to send him a copy of any of these memoranda which we wrote.

Now, of course, if I was asked to draft a telegram—if I was asked to draft a telegram or correspondence for General Stilwell's signature or for actual staff use, I would not retain any copy and, of course, would not send any copy to Mr. Davies.

It was only these reportorial memoranda that I wrote describing conversations that I would send a copy to Mr. Davies.

Senator McMAHON. Is Mr. Davies still in the Department?

Mr. SERVICE. He is still in the Department.

Senator McMAHON. Has he got a brother who lives in Philadelphia?

Mr. SERVICE. No; I believe he has only one brother, and that brother is in the Foreign Service, and is stationed out in the field somewhere.

Senator McMAHON. Do you know his first name?

Mr. SERVICE. The brother?

Senator McMAHON. Is his name Richard?

Mr. SERVICE. The only brother that I know is Donald Davies. There is a Richard Davies in the Foreign Service also, but he is no relative.

Mr. MORRIS. What is Mr. John Davies' present position?

Mr. SERVICE. He is a member of the policy planning staff, I believe.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you say that generally Mr. Davies' reports, analysis of the Chinese political situation, coincided with yours?

Mr. SERVICE. Yes, I think they did.

Mr. MORRIS. I am not going into this extensively, but I would like to just introduce one report of Mr. Davies.

Mr. SERVICE. Mr. Davies, of course, was not in China most of the time; he was generally stationed in New Delhi at the rear echelon headquarters, and I, having more experience in China, more recent experience in China, and being on good terms, and having a good many contacts in Chungking, I stayed in Chungking.

Mr. MORRIS. I have here a report of Mr. Davies, How Red are the Chinese Communists.

Senator McMAHON. May I ask what this designed to prove? I would like to know the connection in your mind.

Mr. MORRIS. There are two reasons, Senator: I notice that Mr. Service always sent his reports to Mr. Davies. Also I note there was an identity of thought expressed in the various memoranda, and in order to support my statement to that effect, I am just introducing one copy, and I want to ask him if his report coincided with his.

Senator McMAHON. What I would like to know is what it proves of interest to our investigation. Is there any allegation that Mr. Davies gave out any information?

Mr. MORRIS. I do not know.

Senator McMAHON. Well, is there any allegation—

Mr. MORRIS. Well, Mr. Davies first came into the discussion the other day when Mr. Kennan was the one who analyzed the reports of Mr. Service. Now, Mr. Davies is an assistant to Mr. Kennan.

Senator McMAHON. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. I would like to point out in fact that here is Mr. Davies whose reports coincide with Mr. Service, and who is an assistant to Mr. Kennan.

Senator McMAHON. That is in the record. But what I am trying to get at is, I realize we are not holding a hearing where we abide by the rules of evidence, but there is reason not to encumber this record, I think you will agree with me.

As a lawyer, I do not see any connection between him, Davies, accepting the views of Service with the allegation that Service was too friendly with Jaffe or anybody else. I do not know Davies from Adam, but what does that prove regarding Service's questionable conduct?

Mr. MORRIS. I do not think it is only Mr. Service's questionable conduct. It is the whole policy of the State Department with respect to representatives in the field.

Senator McMAHON. No, that is not the question.

Mr. MORRIS. If you want to restrict it to the Amerasia case, if you are restricting this to the Amerasia aspect of it, I say that it true.

Senator McMAHON. You see what we are doing here is investigating disloyalty in the State Department, and we are going over the Amerasia case so far as it reflects that kind of thing. Now, in some cases we have gone far afield, and I wish you would not go too far afield, and if there is any allegation that Mr. Davies was disloyal, I think that would be, perhaps, material. I do not know of any allegation, and that is why I am asking you the question.

Mr. MORRIS. I think one day we had it out here, Senator, when someone asked me why I thought the Amerasia case was important, and I said that one of the reasons was that a summary of the records

seized in the Amerasia case shows that there were several Foreign Service officers and State Department officers in the field whose reports all seemed to coincide, and whose reports differently reflected pro-Communist leanings.

We have had testimony to that effect. Now, here in noticing this, Mr. Service makes up a report, and he would always send a copy to Mr. Davies, and I thought it might be pertinent. Perhaps I am wrong, but I thought it might be pertinent at this juncture for us to introduce one of Mr. Davies' reports into the record. If you think it is not relevant, I will withdraw it.

Senator McMAHON. Not at all. If it is on the ground of proving something with regard to this witness. The question is does it prove something on Davies?

Mr. MORRIS. I am not directing this to any individual at all, Senator. Remember, when somebody asked me—I did not volunteer the statement—what I thought was the importance of the Amerasia case, I said, the Amerasia case to me is one of the cases—the important aspect of it is that the records seized in the Amerasia office showed that there were quite a number of Foreign Service officers and State Department officials in the field who were sending reports back to Washington which indicated a definite pro-Communist bias, and that is significant.

Senator McMAHON. And you are offering it then in connection with a reflection to be drawn from that on Davies?

Mr. MORRIS. Well, I guess you could say that.

Senator TYDINGS. General Marshall himself went out to China and tried to bring the Communists and the Nationalists together, as you yourself know. I do not think that because a man may say one thing or the other, that necessarily is disloyal. You may disagree with it, and I may disagree with it, but that in itself, if it is an honest expression of opinion as to what he thinks the policy should be, particularly when a war is going on, as to how we can save our own lives, is not necessarily disloyal.

It can be wrong, and I think we have gotten away from our whole scope of this investigation, and I must insist that the questions be brought more in line with Resolution 231 to investigate whether or not persons in the State Department have been or are disloyal. I do not want to make it very narrow, but I ask you, not as an order, but as a request, to try to come back into the general purview.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, Senator, some of them say this. I think if we are going to show anything in this investigation it is going to be and will contain three types of proof. One will be by direct association, if we had somebody who was a member of the Communist Party—

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead with your questions, and if they get out of line I am going to ask that we rule on them so that we can get along here. I do not want to go into these half-way things, and I do not want to be—

Mr. MORRIS. Well, Senator, I think a man's writings and a man's associations are one of the few ways we have of showing whether or not he has been disloyal.

Senator TYDINGS. If they show disloyalty; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. That is what I am submitting.



Senator TYDINGS. But if they show a difference in point of view; no.

Senator LODGE. The questions that Mr. Morris wants to ask are questions which are in the minds of a great many Americans, and if this investigation is to have validity and carry conviction with the people you want to convince, not the people who agree with you already, it seems to me that his questions are entitled to be answered.

Senator TYDINGS. I want him to have a wide latitude, but I want to see—

Senator McMAHON. In view of Mr. Morris' remarks, I have no objection to Mr. Davies' statement going into the record, but I thought it proper at this point to try to point out some of the limitations implicit in our investigation.

Now, I have been informed, and have never verified it myself, that General Hurley made a statement after he saw Mr. Stalin one time that he took Mr. Stalin's word for his statement, and believed in Mr. Stalin's statement that Mr. Stalin was not interested in the Chinese Communists.

Now, I would certainly, knowing General Hurley, not put that in the record for the purpose of showing that he was inclined to be a Communist. Do you follow me? That is true, is it not, what General Hurley said at one time? I have been informed that was his statement.

Mr. MORRIS. I do not know.

Senator TYDINGS. The questions ought to have some relevancy. (Discussion off the record.)

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead.

Senator McMAHON. Put in Mr. Davies' statement.

Mr. MORRIS. Remember, my reason for going into the personal effects—

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead.

Senator McMAHON. Let us put in Mr. Davies' statement.

Senator TYDINGS. Do you want Mr. Davies' statement in?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. Without objection it will be put in the record. (The document referred to follows:)

DOCUMENT J 108 y  
RF Q 306

1. Agency where prepared: OWI.
2. Agency where routed:
3. Where recovered: Amerasia.
4. Original or copy: Typed copy and carbons.
5. Copies found elsewhere:
6. Abstract of document:
  - (1) Yenan, November 7, 1944. Subject: How Red are the Chinese Communists? by John Davies. Memo points out moderateness of Communists, their willingness to cooperate and to make concessions.
  - (2) Yenan, November 7, 1944. Subject: Will the Communists Take Over China? by John Davies. Memo reflects Davies' opinion that the Communists are in China to stay, China's destiny is in their hands, and they possess strength and vitality superior to that of Chiang and his followers. (Original typed copy with four copies.)
7. Comments of agency preparing document: An item, not an exact copy, but of the same substance, was located by Helen Groves in OWI files, July 5, 1945; filed in China Section, room 3036.
8. Comments of agency receiving document: None.
9. Laboratory examination: Latents (Iodine), none; typewriting, ident K4-KB.
10. Comments:
11. Agent who can introduce document: George E. Allen.

## HOW RED ARE THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS?

The Chinese Communists are backsliders. They still acclaim the infallibility of Marxian dogma and call themselves Communists. But they have become indulgent of human frailty and confess that China's Communist salvation can be attained only through prolonged evolutionary rather than immediate revolutionary conversation. Like that other eminent backslider, Ramsay MacDonald, they have come to accept the inevitability of gradualness.

Yenan is no Marxist New Jerusalem. The saints and prophets of Chinese communism, living in the austere comfort of caves scooped out of loess cliffs, lust after the strange gods of class compromise and party coalition, rather shamefacedly worship the golden calf of foreign investments and yearn to be considered respectable by worldly standards.

All of this is more than scheming Communist opportunism. Whatever the orthodox Communist theory may be about reversion from expedient compromise to pristine revolutionary ardor, the Chinese Communist leaders are realistic enough to recognize that they have now deviated so far to the right that they will return to the revolution only if driven to it by overwhelming pressure from domestic and foreign forces of reaction.

There are several reasons for the moderation of the Communists.

1. They are Chinese. Being Chinese, they are, for all of their early excesses, temperamentally inclined to compromise and harmony in human relationships.

2. They are realists. They recognize that the Chinese masses is 90 percent peasantry; that the peasantry is semi-feudal—culturally, economically, and politically in the Middle Ages; that not until China has developed through several generations will it be ready for communism; that the immediate program must therefore be elementary agrarian reform and the introduction of political democracy.

3. They are nationalists. In more than 7 years of bitter fighting against a foreign enemy the primary emotional and intellectual emphasis has shifted from internal social revolution to nationalism.

4. They have begun to come into power. As has been the experience in virtually all successful revolutionary movements, accession to power is bringing a sobering realization of responsibility and a desire to move cautiously and moderately.

Chinese Communist moderation and willingness to make concessions must not be confused with softness or decay. The Communists are the toughest, best organized and disciplined group in China. They offer cooperation to Chiang out of strength, not out of weakness.

JOHN DAVIES.

YENAN, November 7, 1944.

## WILL THE COMMUNISTS TAKE OVER CHINA?

The Chinese Communists are so strong between the Great Wall and the Yangtze that they can now look forward to the postwar control of at least north China. They may also continue to hold not only those parts of the Yangtze Valley which they now dominate but also new areas in central and south China. The Communists have fallen heir to these new areas by a process, which has been operating for 7 years, whereby Chiang Kai-shek loses his cities and principal lines of communication to the Japanese and the countryside to the Communists.

The Communists have survived 10 years of civil war and 7 years of Japanese offensives. They have survived not only more sustained enemy pressure than the Chinese Central Government forces have been subjected to, but also a severe blockade imposed by Chiang.

They have survived and they have grown. Communist growth since 1937 has been almost geometric in progression. From control of some 100,000 square kilometers with a population of one million and a half they have expanded to about 850,000 square kilometers with a population of approximately ninety million. And they will continue to grow.

The reason for this phenomenal vitality and strength is simple and fundamental. It is mass support, mass participation. The Communist governments and armies are the first governments and armies in modern Chinese history to have positive and widespread popular support. They have this support because the governments and armies are genuinely of the people.

Only if he is able to enlist foreign intervention on a scale equal to the Japanese invasion of China will Chiang probably be able to crush the Communists. But foreign intervention on such a scale would seem to be unlikely. Relying upon his dispirited shambling legions, his decadent corrupt bureaucracy, his sterile political moralisms, and such nervous foreign support as he can muster, the generalissimo may nevertheless plunge China into civil war. He cannot succeed, however, where the Japanese in more than 7 years of determined striving have failed. The Communists are already too strong for him.

Civil war would probably end in a mutually exhausted stalemate. China would be divided into at least two camps with Chiang reduced to the position of a regional warlord. The possibility should not be overlooked of the Communists—certainly if they receive foreign aid—emerging from a civil war swiftly and decisively victorious, in control of all China.

Since 1937 the Communists have been trying to persuade Chiang to form a democratic coalition government in which they would participate. Should the generalissimo accept this compromise proposal and a coalition government be formed with Chiang at the head, the Communists may be expected to continue effective control over the areas which they now hold. They will also probably extend their political influence throughout the rest of the country, for they are the only group in China possessing a program with positive appeal to the people.

If the generalissimo neither precipitates a civil war nor reaches an understanding with the Communists, he is still confronted with defeat. Chiang's feudal China cannot long exist alongside a modern dynamic popular government in north China.

The Communists are in China to stay. And China's destiny is not Chiang's but theirs.

JOHN DAVIES.

YENAN, November 7, 1944.

Mr. SERVICE. We are going to hear it?

Senator TYDINGS. Do you want to comment on it?

Mr. SERVICE. I don't know what is in it, what it is.

Senator TYDINGS. If you did not write it, I do not know what your comment would be.

Mr. MORGAN. I think the question was asked, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not Mr. Service's ideas coincided with Mr. Davies. He answered the question, and to that extent—

Senator TYDINGS. There would be some propriety.

Mr. MORRIS. I think the decision the other day was that, after we made reference to these various reports by Mr. Service, that they would be introduced in the record.

Mr. MORGAN. As I understand it, the decision was that those reports from which extracts were read into the record, in such cases, the full report was to be incorporated in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. All right, they will be incorporated in the record.

Have you any comment, Mr. Service, to make? Please come to the point if you can, and let us get along. Go ahead. What is your comment?

Mr. SERVICE. I would like to point out this was written during a period when I was not in China, and I do not remember when I saw this for the first time. When I said that I had general agreement with Mr. Davies, I was thinking of our general philosophy of the whole situation, and the best means of dealing with it.

That line of thinking, which we shared, is most conveniently summarized in annex 47 of the China white paper, which has excerpts from both of our reports, and I would like to refer you to that.

Mr. MORRIS. I have read that.

Mr. SERVICE. I was thinking particularly of certain papers which Mr. Davies had written, which I was familiar with, which are incor-

porated, or excerpts from it are incorporated, in the transcript of the hearings of the Loyalty Board, where Mr. Davies testified, but those are rather lengthy and, perhaps, you would not wish to have them read here.

Senator TYDINGS. Except to comment on it generally. It is not your comment; it is Mr. Davies'. Let us get on.

Mr. RHETTS. In that connection, Senator, I certainly have no disposition to extend this. I do have a feeling, however, that if Mr. Service's views are to be associated as coinciding with Mr. Davies in some isolated paper written by Mr. Davies, which is to be put in the record, I have a feeling that it is only proper to—

Senator TYDINGS. You would have to take all of his papers and all of his views, and take them together and associate them to be useful. It is just the same principle as letting in one paragraph of a document instead of the whole document.

Mr. RHETTS. That is, at least, why I would like to refer the committee—I would like to request that these writings also be made part of the record, as has just been made of this paper.

Senator TYDINGS. I think Mr. Service is in a position where he wrote a hundred and some reports, and they ought to be judged pretty well on what he wrote himself, not to give his opinion on what somebody else's philosophy is.

Mr. MORGAN. There was one word that Mr. Service used, although I do not want to get into the question of semantics. That word sometimes has connotations today that may not be those of normal times.

You used the expression, I believe, that you and Mr. Davies had a similar "philosophy" with respect to the situation. What did you mean by that?

Mr. SERVICE. We shared a generally similar outlook on the long-range problems that faced the United States, the problems of the balance of power in the Far East, and the means which our policy should seek to follow to maintain United States position in the Far East, and to keep China from falling entirely into the Russian orbit, which we saw as early as 1943 was the great danger.

Mr. MORGAN. Thank you.

Senator TYDINGS. All right, go ahead, Mr. Morris.

Mr. SERVICE. May I also make some comment on this: Reference was made to Mr. Kennan recently, and I would like to read from the transcript of our hearings before the—

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead and read it.

Mr. SERVICE (continuing). State Department Loyalty Board. Mr. Kennan was asked:

By the way, Mr. Kennan, will you state to the Board whether you are acquainted with Mr. Service?

Mr. KENNAN. I have never met Mr. Service before he returned on this occasion, and I have never spoken with him excepting concerning the technique or arrangement for my appearing here. I purposely did not discuss anything that I thought I was going to say on this occasion with him or with anyone that I thought might be in communication with him, and have never discussed the contents of his reports. I had also not read the reports before this except insofar as they contained in the white paper; so that they came to me fresh.

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. I have a letter signed by a man named "Julian", addressed to "Dear Jack," which was found in your possession. I wonder if you will identify this. It is Q-404.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

DOCUMENT S-67

Q-404

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION,  
May 14, 1945.

DEAR JACK: I met your wife the other evening, and your delightful children as well. Phil had arranged with Carolyn to bring Messrs. Tung and Chen to Berkeley, and we had dinner together, along with Martin Wilbur. During the course of conversation, Carolyn mentioned her need of a washing machine in Washington. I told her that if worse comes to worse you might be able to have my family's machine which is now up on Long Island. Carolyn got all excited about this suggestion, and she said that she would write you about it. If you have been looking for one in Washington, I suggest that you continue to do so. You should also inquire about the possibility of new machines coming on the market in the near future. If your efforts in Washington all lead up a blind alley, then it would be practical to consider shipping my family's machine—if you want it—from Long Island to Washington. I just thought that I should explain this to you in case Carolyn's letter discourages you from continuing your search for a machine.

The conference is rather dull, and I find it very depressing. I imagine that this conference may go down as one of the most reactionary international gatherings in history. The only consolation I can find is that the fantastic views on international organization—views which are in essence quite contrary to real and sound international organization—may contribute to breaking down such outmoded concepts as sovereign equality and nation-state system of international relations. But they offer nothing in place of these traditional elements of world affairs.

Phil is keeping the most disgraceful company these days. It is practically certain now that he'll return to Chungking as Minister Counselor and Hurley's houseboy. He is taking his job seriously and even shows some compassion over the inconvenience which members of the Chinese delegation occasionally have to endure. He is first-rate on seeing that T. V.'s car turns up at the right place at the right time.

John Carter has been introducing me around as the labor attaché for Chungking. The local liberal and labor groups have had me out for a party to meet the right-minded people. Saturday I was introduced to Tarasov, Soviet trade-union representative on the World Trade Union Council. He told that he didn't know that north China was called Communist China. He asked whether they were "Communists" or not. He stated that the Soviet Government favored unity in China and that the United States and Soviet Union should cooperate in bringing about such unity. I am planning to bring John Carter together with Tarasov and another Soviet trade-union leader, Kuznetsov (who is the head of the Soviet trade-union movement and an important figure in Soviet high policy). We may not learn much, but we might get some better line on Soviet psychology on the Pacific, specifically, the China question.

Not much else to say. I won't go into detail about the conference. It isn't too difficult to read between the lines in the press to see what is happening here.

Best regards,

JULIAN.

Mr. MORRIS. I wonder if you will look at that letter and identify the writer and the addressee.

Mr. SERVICE. Well, I had forgotten all about this letter until it was shown to me by the Department of State loyalty board. I assume that the writer must be a man named Julian Friedman, who was an employee of the Department of State at that time, and was at San Francisco, I think, as a liaison officer of some sort.

Mr. MORRIS. And he was writing to you?

Mr. SERVICE. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. Speak the least bit more loudly, please.

Mr. MORRIS. And the John Carter referred to in this letter was, I take it, John Carter Vincent?

Mr. SERVICE. I assume so.

Mr. MORRIS. And he says: "Phil is keeping the most disgraceful company these days."

Who is Phil?

Mr. SERVICE. I assume he means Philip Spouse.

Mr. MORRIS. What was his assignment at that time?

Mr. SERVICE. He was also a liaison officer. His duties were liaison with the Chinese delegation, I think.

Mr. MORRIS. He says:

Saturday I was introduced to Tarasov, Soviet trade-union representative on the World Trade Union Council. He told that he didn't know that north China was called Communist China. He asked whether they were "Communists" or not.

He stated that the Soviet Government favored unity in China and that the United States and Soviet Union should cooperate in bringing about such unity. I am planning to bring John Carter together with Tarasov and another Soviet trade-union leader, Kuznetsov (who is the head of the Soviet trade-union movement and an important figure in Soviet high policy). We may not learn much, but we might get some better line on Soviet psychology on the Pacific, specifically, the China question.

Was there ever any follow-up that you knew of on that proposal?

Mr. SERVICE. Not that I know of. Mr. Friedman was, as I remember, a labor economist, and was later assigned as labor attaché. I suppose that is the basis of his meeting with these Russian labor officials.

The interesting thing there, of course, is that Tarasov, whatever the man's name is, is reflecting the official Moscow line, which Molotov and Stalin had been giving General Hurley, which Mr. Kennan and the Embassy in Moscow, and in which I myself reporting to Chungking, thought was false.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you report that, Mr. Service?

Mr. SERVICE. I have here, for instance, a report which I wrote on February 16, 1945, just about the date of Yalta, of conversations with a man by the name of Vinogradoff, who was the press attaché, in which I report Mr. Vinogradoff making a statement such as this:

Senator McMAHON. October 1944?

Mr. SERVICE. No, this is February 16, 1945. This is Mr. Vinogradoff speaking:

Our policy is definite and clear. We, Russia, will certainly have a voice in the affairs of the Far East, but we will do nothing to assist, support, or encourage the present Government of China.

That is a very different line which I was getting from Vinogradoff and reporting, very different line from the high level Moscow line at that time, that they were all for better relations in the Central Government.

Senator McMAHON. What line was General Hurley taking?

Mr. SERVICE. General Hurley was saying continually that he had been assured by Moscow, by Molotov and Stalin, and he says here at the hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I quote from page 31—this is December 1945, hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

Russia has said from the beginning that the Chinese Communists are not, in fact, Communists at all; that Russia has not supported the Chinese Communists; that Russia does support the National Government of the Republic of China, and the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek; that Russia desires closer and more harmonious relations with China.

This attitude was the attitude of General Hurley, and there are numerous quotations from General Hurley as to where he says the same thing.

Senator McMAHON. Is he reporting the fact or is he reporting his belief in the truth of that fact?

Mr. SERVICE. I think if you read the hearings and you read the white paper, that he believed those, and he was cautioned by the State Department not to put too much weight in them, and that was one of his complaints in the State Department that they changed his instructions, as he said, on the basis of State Department Embassy Moscow unwillingness to accept the assurances of Stalin and Molotov.

Senator McMAHON. And your point is, if I understand you correctly, that you did not believe this line that was coming out of Moscow?

Mr. SERVICE. That is correct.

Senator McMAHON. Because you were being told something different in the field, which you reported to the State Department.

Mr. SERVICE. A, because it was not logical and did not make sense; and, B, because my opinion was confirmed by Communist officials, Soviet officials, in Chungking.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you ever report that, Mr. Service?

Mr. SERVICE. I read you excerpts from a report which I wrote on February 16, 1945.

Mr. MORRIS. In support of that conclusion?

Mr. SERVICE. Yes; I quote Mr. Vinogradoff in saying, "We are not going to support or encourage the present Government of China."

Mr. MORRIS. I know that, but you just quoted him; you did not give your own opinion at that time?

Mr. SERVICE. In a report which I wrote on the next day, February 17, 1945, commenting on the Soviet statements on Chinese hopes of making a deal with Russia, I point out in conclusion—

The Russians in Chungking are being frigid toward a central government and talking freely of their low opinion of it, and correspondingly high opinion of Yen-an. Furthermore, there is not much exchangeable quid pro quo—

I had been discussing the early part of the report of the inducements which the Chinese could offer the Soviets to make a treaty—

The Chinese are not likely to make concessions in Sinkiang, outer Mongolia, or Manchuria. Finally the objective circumstances are not favorable. The Central Government and Chiang are weaker than France and DeGaulle. The Chinese Communists are stronger than the FFI—

French Forces in the Interior—

and getting stronger rapidly. Both Russia and the Chinese Communists can do very well, therefore, by sitting tight and waiting.

In other words, I did not see that it was to Russia's interest—

Senator TYDINGS. All right, the next question.

Mr. SERVICE. This may be off the subject a little bit, but in connection with the views of Mr. Davies and myself concerning the Chinese Communists, I think we ought to refer to such statements as this made to the press at a press conference had by General Hurley on April 6, 1945.

Mr. MORGAN. What is that you are reading from?

Mr. SERVICE. This is from the text, stenographic text, of the press conference, radio and press conference. I am sorry, the date was

April 2, 1945, with Ambassador Hurley meeting the press, and I quote. Mr. Hurley says:

You gentlemen should know, though I believe you all do know, that it is a matter of common knowledge that the Communist Party of China supports the principles of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. That was generally referred to as the people's three principles of China.

Senator TYDINGS. Sun Yat-sen? You mean the great Chinese leader for democracy and liberation?

Mr. SERVICE. That is correct.

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead.

Mr. SERVICE. Mr. Hurley continues:

The three principles are government of the people, by the people, and for the people. All the demands that the Communist Party has been making have been on a democratic basis. That has led to the statement that the Communist Party in China are not in fact real Communists. The Communist Party of China is supporting exactly the same principles as those promulgated by the National Government of China.

I mean I can quote at great length from General Hurley.

Senator TYDINGS. I think you ought to put the whole thing in the record.

Mr. SERVICE. There is a great deal of this contained in the transcript of hearing before the Loyalty Board, but I have not wanted to protract things unnecessarily here.

Senator TYDINGS. Can't you put in the record those parts of General Hurley's releases which are on all fours which you have just read to show there was a general point of view shared by many people of a wide variety of political beliefs at that particular time?

Mr. MORGAN. Do you know how General Hurley used the word "democratic," Mr. Service?

Mr. SERVICE. No, I don't except that he has associated with those principles of government the principles "of the people, for the people, and by the people."

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead. We will put those in. Let us go ahead, Mr. Morris, unless you have got some more, Mr. Service.

Mr. SERVICE. Would you like more of it, sir?

Senator TYDINGS. Yes, if it is not too long.

Mr. SERVICE. The next question is:

Sir, I am not sure that I understood that last sentence. You said the Communist Party is supporting the same principles as the National Government of China?

General Hurley's answer was: Yes.

Question. Could you tell us what is the divergence between them? How do they differ?

Answer. Well, as a matter of fact, the divergence between the parties in China seems to be not in the objective desired because they both assert that they are for the establishment of a government in China that will decentralize authority and conduct itself along democratic lines, employing democratic processes; the divergence between them is the procedure by which they can be achieved. To go a little further, the Communist Party would like for the National Government to inaugurate certain reforms immediately, and to do that they have suggested a bipartisan coalition government.

Senator McMAHON. Was he for that? Was Hurley for the coalition, the bipartisan government?

Mr. SERVICE. Certainly, sir, that was one of his basic directives.



Senator McMAHON. Did he indicate personal agreement with that objective?

Mr. SERVICE. Certainly.

Senator McMAHON. Have you got the excerpts which you can put in the record?

Senator GREEN. Are we proceeding?

Senator LODGE. Are we making progress?

Senator McMAHON. As far as I am concerned we are making progress, because I want to know what this man Hurley was doing.

Senator TYDINGS. I was going to suggest this, Senator McMahon: Evidently in order to make a compilation with any degree of comprehension, we ought to give the witness a chance to supplement his remarks by putting it in the record later when he can hunt it up.

Senator LODGE. I suggest that the witness be given every opportunity to prepare a statement, and let it be submitted to us, and then be made part of the record.

Senator GREEN. Every opportunity in addition to the present.

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Senator McMAHON. Let me make it clear as to what I want: I want Hurley's philosophy, Hurley's views, and I want the documentation of those views.

Senator LODGE. That is perfectly all right with me.

Senator TYDINGS. We do not want them next year, we want them soon.

Mr. RHETTS. We will be glad to prepare that out of the material we have here, including the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee transcript.

Mr. MORRIS. I think also that we should have General Hurley's testimony.

Senator TYDINGS. I have been in touch with General Hurley several times, and the most recent time was several days ago.

He does not want to testify. He tells me he has nothing to contribute to the testimony that he has contributed before the Foreign Relations Committee; I have so stated to the committee, in a message, and so stated in the press.

I urged General Hurley to come and testify, but he does not want to come because he says he cannot bring out anything that we do not already know.

Senator GREEN. When was that?

Senator TYDINGS. That was about—

Mr. RHETTS. December 5, 6, 7 and 10, 1945, Senator Green.

Senator GREEN. I remember that; I took part in it. I would like to refresh my recollection on my cross-examination.

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, I have here a list of names that appeared in Mr. Service's address book. Now, I think for the sake of expediency, I would like to give the list to Mr. Service and ask him to go through the list and tell us briefly what his associations have been with the particular people, and who they are.

Senator TYDINGS. May I ask you what the point of this interrogation is?

Mr. MORRIS. Well, a man's address book, Senator, presumably contains a list of his associates.

Senator TYDINGS. Granted.

Mr. MORRIS. I think who Mr. Service's associates are is something that is pertinent to this inquiry.

Senator TYDINGS. Well, didn't he identify them the other day for you?

Mr. MORRIS. He did not.

Senator TYDINGS. He did not?

Mr. MORRIS. I selected 10 or 12 from the list the other day. I did not want to go into it any further then because—

Mr. SERVICE. Whom did we discuss the other day?

Mr. MORRIS. We had Lattimore, Duncan Lee. We had Sol Adler. There are three on the first page.

Senator TYDINGS. I would say that if they are in Mr. Service's addresses, obviously he has some kind of an acquaintanceship with them. That is conceded. What more proof do you want than that?

Mr. MORRIS. A complete identity is not here.

Senator TYDINGS. Does that show disloyalty to the State Department? Does it have some relevance to Mr. Service's disloyalty, as a disloyal citizen?

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, as I pointed out the other day, some of these people have been identified before congressional committees as Soviet agents.

Senator TYDINGS. That is not necessarily so. Some of them have been designated as Soviet agents, but that does not make them so.

Mr. MORRIS. I submit that if we have testimony before a congressional committee and I also understand—

Senator TYDINGS. I am not a very strong believer in that sort of testimony to hang people on, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. I am not hanging anyone on it, Senator, I am submitting—

Senator TYDINGS. I have no objection to its going in and having Mr. Service making any comment that you want him to make.

Mr. MORRIS. I think in all fairness, rather than use the expression "hang someone on it," I think it is a very unfair term. I think that is something we should take into consideration for future study.

Senator TYDINGS. All right, go ahead.

Senator GREEN. How many of them are there altogether?

Senator TYDINGS. We are getting pretty far afield. What you want are acts, not people he knows.

I now know Mr. Browder. I met him the other day, and what's this other fellow—

Mr. MORRIS. That is not in your address book; this is something else.

Senator TYDINGS. I may be in his address book, and that might make me guilty.

Mr. MORRIS. If I am going too far afield—

Senator TYDINGS. I think you are. It may be somewhat captious. You may put it in the record, but I do not think you ought to draw any conclusions.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, I draw no conclusions from this at all.

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead, let us get along.

What is the question?

Mr. MORRIS. Well, Senator, as I say, if you think it is not pertinent, and you do not think we ought to go into it—

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we should let Mr. Morris ask the questions.

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Service, just take them up one at a time and tell us who they are.

Mr. SERVICE. The first name is Terrell, a British diplomat who was stationed in Washington for some time. I had known him and had been a neighbor of his in Shanghai and saw him for supper.

The name Jones is Col. Paul Jones, who had previously been public-relations officer, China-Burma, India theater.

The next name, I believe, is copied incorrectly. It should be Reichner. I believe she was a woman working on biographic information for OSS, with whom I had agreed to offer—to whom I had offered to make available my knowledge, particularly regarding Communist personalities. I spent several afternoons with her in OSS being interrogated regarding specific people.

The next man Weaver, I believe, is a captain working in Army Intelligence.

The next name Rose Ellen refers to a Yardoumian, and Ellen Atkinson.

Rose Yardoumian, as I testified, was the secretary of the Washington office of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Ellen Atkinson was employed in the War Department, MIS, as a researcher on the Far East.

This engagement refers to the party on the 29th of May which I attended which they gave in honor of Lieutenant and Mrs. Roth.

The next name, Senator Pepper, needs no explaining.

The next name is Rankin. He was a lieutenant colonel, had been in Chungking as assistant public-relations officer, and at this time was in Washington temporarily. I saw him for lunch.

The next three entries have to do with a week end at the Lattimores'. The entry for 12 noon on June 5 is a mistake in copying. It should be Linebarger, who had formerly been professor at Duke University. During the war was in Military Intelligence, and during the war was a member of the staff at G-2 in Chungking, and was back in Washington attached to the Psychological Warfare Branch.

The next one was Ray Burns.

The next name is Gebb. I don't remember Mr. Gebb, but it is written right after his name "OSS" here, meaning that he was coming to my office.

There were a good many research specialists in the other agencies who were continually contacting me with respect to some particular line or field of work in which they were engaged where they thought that I might be able to give them some help, and this was undoubtedly such a man.

The next name is Duncan Lee, concerning whom I have already testified. He had arranged to lunch with me.

Now I come to the address book proper.

Mr. MORRIS. The name "Adler" begins the address book.

Mr. SERVICE. I am sorry. I come to the address book proper. This was a new address book, as I remember it, just concerning this particular period. The first name is Adler, whom I have already testified concerning.

The next name is Arneson, Elizabeth Yard. I did not know Mr. Arneson well. He was at that time employed with OWI, I believe. He was a native Icелander, naturalized American.

Elizabeth Yard, his wife, was my friend. She was the daughter of missionaries in west China, the same age as myself, and I had grown up with her and kept contact with her. I had seen them, they lived over in Arlington.

Brooks Atkinson, correspondent for the New York Times, and probably my closest friend in China.

Carl Arnold was General Stilwell's aide.

Lt. Emil Brown—that is a mistake, it should be Lt. Emily Brown—was an old friend of my wife's. She was at that time in the WAC. She had been a college friend of my wife's and myself, too, for that matter, but I had never known her very well. She is a newspaper woman, was a newspaper woman before the war, and is now with the United Press in the Far East.

Barnett is Robert Barnett. At that time he was in the Army, and presently with the State Department.

Carr, I don't remember what Carr that is.

Mr. MORRIS. Could that be Drew Pearson's assistant?

Mr. SERVICE. It might be, it might well be.

Colling was a young captain in the OSS, who had been a member of the observer group at Yen-an. He was, what you would call, a sort of guerrilla-warfare man, a demolitions man, and he had just recently returned to Washington to make his reports to OSS, and brought back a lot of films, and they were trying to put together a picture of Chinese Communist guerrilla operations, and I went over to OSS and saw those films several times, consulted with them on it.

John Caldwell was a friend whom I had known since we were boys together in China. He was with OWI, was with me in China, and was back with me in China on the China desk of OWI.

Cowan was an officer in the headquarters at Chungking who happened to be back here temporarily in the War Department.

Dan Davis—that should be Don Davis, is a copying mistake—he was at that time an officer in Naval Intelligence. Marty refers to C. Martin Wilbur, who was head of the Political Branch of the Far Eastern Section of Research and Analysis, which is OSS, formerly a China boy; also a professor and curator in the Field Museum, and came into the OSS during the war.

Dennison refers to a man whom I had known out in China with the National City Bank. I think it was the National City Bank or possibly the Chase Bank, and he was back here with the RFC during the war. His wife had been a college friend of my wife and myself.

Drumright was Everett F. Drumright, an American Foreign Service officer, who was Assistant Chief, Division of Chinese Affairs, State Department.

Emmerson is a fellow service officer, Japan expert, who had been one of the four Foreign Service officers attached to General Stilwell's staff.

Mr. MORRIS. Who were the four, by the way?

Mr. SERVICE. John Davis, Raymond P. Ludden, John Emmerson, and myself.

Lee Engilahl was the widow of a Foreign Service officer who had served with me at Shanghai, and whom we had known very well.

Mr. MORRIS. What was his name?

Mr. SERVICE. His name was Russell Engdahl. He was killed during internment in Hong Kong during the early part of the war. She was employed by the State Department at this time on some sort of a visa review board. She is now vice consul in the Foreign Service and stationed at Tehran.

The next name I think is a mistake in copying. It should be Fickan. He was a man who was a house mate of mine at college. He was a mathematician, had been a professor and was employed during the war by the Navy.

John Fairbanks, now professor of oriental history at Harvard University, during the war was head of far eastern operations for OWI. At this time he was in Washington for employment with OWI.

Hon. C. E. Gauss, of course, was former Ambassador, and my former chief in China.

The next name is Mark Gayn.

Griffiths refers to Col. Samuel P. Griffiths, United States Marine Corps, who had been a Navy language officer in Peking, studying Chinese at the same time I was in Peking in 1936 and 1937. I had kept up my friendship with him.

Gentile is, so far as I can remember, one of those research specialists in OSS who came over to see me on some particular project that he was working on where he hoped that I could give him some advice.

Now, the next item, Garrisonville, Va., "Ask for Tom Waller," does not ring any bell right now. I don't know who Tom Waller is. That might be a mistake in copying. I mean there are so many mistakes in copying.

The next name is Hutchinson. He was a lieutenant colonel in OSS in one of their more secret branches, who had been out in the Far East, and with whom I had consulted on a number of projects which they had contemplated undertaking.

Hitch was an assistant naval attaché in Chungking during part of my period there. He had returned to Washington and was on duty here.

Christine Homan was the wife of an economist who was working for some Government bureau. I think he is employed at present with the President's Council of Economic Advisers. I had known the Homans first in Peking. They had visited there in 1936 or 1937. I had become acquainted with them there, and I was invited to their house for dinner or something here in Washington.

Captain Harris was a young man over in MIS, a researcher in the social branch of or a special branch of something of the sort there who had been present at some interrogation, and had come over to consult me further on some points he was interested in.

Hatem is Corp. J. W., who is a brother of an American doctor who had gone out to China about 1936 or 1937, and had stayed with the Chinese Communists. This doctor in Yenan had asked me to write a letter to his family back here and let them know he was well, and this man Hatem, his younger brother, had come up to see me.

Mr. MORRIS. Was Dr. Hatem a Communist?

Mr. SERVICE. I suppose he must have been to stay there all that time, but I don't know whether he was actually a party member or not.

Harold Isaacs, of course, was at that time correspondent in China of Newsweek, and he had recently returned to the States and was living in New York.

Phil Jaffe we have already discussed.

Col. Paul Jones, his name I already mentioned. His name appears on my date pad.

Herbert Little had formerly been with the Chinese Maritime Customs in China. Since the war he has been the senior foreigner with the Chinese Customs Service. During the war he was returned from internment, I think, and he was with the OSS, and I saw him here in Washington on OSS business.

Freddy Lyon, of course, was the security officer of the Department of State.

Ludden is Raymond P. Ludden, whom I have discussed.

Lattimore I have discussed.

Mrs. W. W. Lockwood is a widow of an old friend of my mother's and father's, who was associated with them, an associate of theirs, out in the YMCA in China.

Capt. Paul Linebarger I have already mentioned. I think that his branch was the Morale Branch of MIS.

Colonel McHugh had formerly been naval attaché in China for a good many years before and during the war. At this period he had been assigned to OSS and was here in Washington.

Colonel Mayer had formerly been military attaché in China and at that time was, I don't know what the term was, Far Eastern specialist in MIS, and he asked me to come over and talk to him and to General Bissell on one occasion.

Mr. RIVETS. Who is General Bissell?

Mr. SERVICE. He was Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, for the United States Army, in charge of intelligence.

Mertsky was a woman who had formerly been on our staff with the consul general in Shanghai. After marriage to a man named Coleman, she left the Foreign Service and was living in New York.

She had been my stenographer for a while in the consulate general in Shanghai.

Colonel McNally was a man I had known in China as a language student, had known him during the war. He went out to China originally in 1934, as aide to General Hurley, returned to Washington thereafter, and was at that time stationed at MIS.

J. K. Penfield is Mr. James Penfield. I gave his address at this time as CINCPAC, commander in chief of the Pacific.

Phoebe Reichner is this woman in OSS who was writing a biographic series, biographic data, whom I was assisting.

Lieutenant Colonel Roberts, his name appears in my pad. He was assistant public relations officer in Chungking.

Lt. Andy Roth we had mentioned.

Ray is a man who had been working for lend-lease out in China, and I had seen him off and on. He had made numerous trips to China, and was here in Washington with FEA.

Snow is Edgar Snow.

Next is Mrs. Harley Stevens. I am trying to think of a Mrs. Harley Stevens. The name does not mean anything to me now, but is an address with OSS, so it must have been somebody working in OSS, somebody in the Research Branch, who had got in touch with me.

Guenther Stein was a correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor and the Manchester Guardian.

Phil Sullivan was in Shanghai, and went to St. John's College. He was employed by the Department of State in the labor end.

Gen. J. W. Schulz is Brig. Gen. John Wesley Schulz, the brother of my wife's father. At that time he was a member of the engineering board. I think the head of the engineering board at Fort Belvoir.

R. M. Service is my younger brother.

George Taylor is a man I had known out in China, where he had taught at Yen-an University, was in the University of Washington, and during the war was employed by OWI on Far Eastern operations, and I had had some contacts with him.

Terrell, I have already mentioned, was the British diplomat who was stationed in Washington, attached to the British Embassy, and I had known him out in China.

The next name is a mistake in copying and should be Tolstoi. He was at that time Major Tolstoi, an OSS officer I had met first in the extreme northwest of China in Lanchow. One of my reasons in going to Lanchow was to carry funds for him, and another officer, who had come from India through Lhasa, up to Lanchow. I saw a good deal of him subsequently in China, and at this time he was back in Washington.

Vino Gradoss, of course, I have already mentioned, was press attaché in Chungking at the Embassy.

Wilbur, I have mentioned as C. Martin Wilbur, at that time attaché to the Research and Analysis Branch of OSS.

Dick Watts is Richard Watts, who was for many years drama critic of New York Herald Tribune. During the war he was in China first for the New York Herald Tribune and later for OWI. I saw a good deal of him in Chungking, and at this time he had returned to the States.

Captain Weaver, as I mentioned, was a research analyst whom I had met.

Senator LODGE. Are you still in touch with Richard Watts?

Mr. SERVICE. No; I have not seen him since 1945.

Senator LODGE. How often had you seen him before that?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, I suppose in Chungking I saw him fairly frequently. I think I saw him once in the spring of 1945 very briefly. I have not seen him since.

Thelma Wolfe—the name does not mean anything to me now.

The last name is apparently a copying mistake. It should be Yardoumian, Rose, whose name I have already mentioned.

Mr. MORRIS. I have no other questions.

Senator LODGE. I have no questions of Mr. Service. There are some questions I would like to ask of Mr. Morgan, due to the fact that Senator Green and I were away as a subcommittee of two, and the rest of the subcommittee very properly went ahead with the development of this case, and I have some points I would like to have cleared up.

I have had a chance to go through the transcript that was developed while Senator Green and I were away, and I have jotted down some questions I would like to ask you.

This first group can be answered "Yes" or "No" if you want to. You do not have to if you do not want to.

Does the subcommittee, or do you as the chief counsel of the subcommittee, feel that you have obtained clear-cut and convincing answers to the following questions:

Why was Jaffe permitted to plead guilty in a brief and almost unnoticed trial, and let off with a fine of \$2,500?

Mr. MORGAN. I would like to ask Mr. Service a couple of questions, first.

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Service, the question I am going to ask you now is, of course, one that probably calls for a self-serving answer, but it is one that I like to see any man in a similar situation place on the record, and that is this: I believe you have testified you have never been a member of the Communist Party; is that correct?

Mr. SERVICE. That is correct. I have never been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MORGAN. Have you ever knowingly associated with members of the Communist Party apart from the association in your official capacity with the Chinese Communists?

Mr. SERVICE. I have never knowingly associated with any Communists other than Chinese Communists in connection with my work in China. I am sorry, I have never knowingly associated with any Communists other than Chinese Communists and Russian diplomatic officials in connection with my official work.

Mr. MORGAN. If you care to, you may, I am sure, at this point indicate on our record your attitude and philosophy with respect to communism. I do not put that as a question. I thought, perhaps, you might want to indicate in our record your sentiments in that respect.

Mr. SERVICE. I am not used to talking about my personal intimate beliefs, but I will try to summarize them.

One has to start with some faith and, I believe, that life was not an accident, that there was a divine purpose, if you call it that, in creation, and particularly in creating man, as the highest and unique type of life.

What makes man unique is his spirit, his mind, his ability to reason; that our task, our mission, our responsibility, call it what you will, is to seek to realize our full potentialities as human beings; that we have had a few insights as to what these potentialities are through people like Jesus Christ.

This philosophy, if you call it that, is, of course, based on the deepest and fullest conception of the rights of the human individual and the dignity of man.

I think that the most important thing in the world is to give the fullest opportunity for us to improve ourselves and to realize our potentialities as human beings and as individuals.

Politically this philosophy, of course, is expressed in democracy, which is based on the rights of the individual, and the dignity of man. It is the exact antithesis of communism, which subordinates a man to the state which denies human rights, and which tries to fit it into a mold, according to a set dogma, which we know is false because it ignores the human spirit, based purely on economic terms.

I think that that is a brief expression of my beliefs.

Mr. MORGAN. Have you ever knowingly at any time submitted, as an officer of the Foreign Service of the State Department on your de-



tached duty, reports other than those which were, insofar as you were concerned, your honest conviction of the true facts?

Mr. SERVICE. I never have submitted any report at any time which was not my conception of the truth, of the true facts at the time.

Mr. MORGAN. Did you ever at any time seek to undermine the policy of this Government, as you knew it and understood it?

Mr. SERVICE. I never sought to undermine the policy of this Government as I understood it. In fact, I think I can conscientiously say that I always sought to further the achievement of this Government's policy.

Mr. MORGAN. I believe those are the only questions I have.

Senator LODGE. Will you give your definition of the word "Communist"?

Mr. SERVICE. A Communist, to my way of thinking, is a person who believes in the infallibility of Marxism, by which I mean a strictly materialistic interpretation of history; the dialectic of Marxism derived from Hegel, who submits himself to rigid party discipline, who adheres wholeheartedly to that dogma to which he is willing to sacrifice his own personal interests in the interest of following orders of the party.

Senator LODGE. Will you define for us the words "Soviet agent"?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, a Soviet agent does not necessarily need to be a Communist. I would say that he has to be so close to communism, however, that he is willing to forego or to abandon his own family, his own life, his own country, in the interests of serving the Soviet Government and the Communist Party.

Senator LODGE. I notice in your definition of "communism," you make no reference to its impact on religion or to its connection with Russia. Is there anything significant in that?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, economic materialism is a denial of religion. I did not tie up with Russia completely because I was thinking of communism in the broad sense as a theory.

Senator LODGE. I am talking about an active modern Communist today, 1950.

Mr. SERVICE. Well, here again we run into complications which, I think, confuse the issue. You could be a Yugoslav and be a Titoist, and still be theoretically a Communist with all the devotion to the dogma and the cause of Marx and all the economic materialism, and all the rest of it.

Senator LODGE. I am asking you to give me your definition of these things. I mean, you must have a definite idea in your mind of what the word "Communist" means to you. Let us take an American Communist, what is the relationship?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, an American Communist is certainly committed to the recognition of the overpowering interests of the Soviet Union. I have absolutely no doubt of that, and relating my definition to me, as an American, I would say that a Communist would have to be one who is committed to supporting the interests of the Communist motherland, the leading party of communism, which is the Russian Communist Party.

Senator LODGE. Thank you.

Mr. MORRIS. May I ask a question? Mr. Service, while you shared an apartment with Adler over the course of a year, as you testified, did

you find his views and his conversations and his outlook on life anti-theoretical to yours?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, we did not argue very much. I don't remember discussing American affairs with him a great deal. I did not always agree with Mr. Adler or follow him on economic discussions, since his knowledge of economics was detailed and specialized, whereas mine was not.

Mr. MORRIS. How about his political views?

Mr. SERVICE. Well, as I say, we were so wrapped up in China, the Chinese theme, that I don't remember much discussion about the United States. Certainly, on China we agreed generally.

Senator GREEN. Are there any other questions?

Senator TYDINGS. I would like to request of you and your counsel that these things you have been requested to put into the record by Senator McMahon while he was here, and perhaps by others, while I do not press you after the ordeal you have been through down with the other hearing, and this one, I would still, however, while your testimony is current, like to get it with a fair amount of promptness so that we can put it in. When do you think you could give us that, Mr. Rhetts?

Mr. RHETTS. We will prepare it. Since we have these materials essentially assembled, it will be a question of putting them together. We will prepare them tonight, and it is a question of getting them mechanically produced.

Senator TYDINGS. That is all right.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator TYDINGS. I have no further questions. If there are no other questions, we will take a recess, and I would like to have the committee members to stay a minute.

Mr. RHETTS. Before we leave, sir, I would like to offer for inclusion in the record at this time a letter addressed to you, Senator Tydings, and which was transmitted to Mr. Service, from Dr. H. C. Mei.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

GRAND LODGE OF FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS OF CHINA,  
Shanghai, China, April 18, 1950.

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,

Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Investigating Subcommittee,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As an American-born Chinese I have known for some 30 years Mr. and Mrs. Robert Roy Service, parents of Hon. John Stewart Service, and also the latter for over 10 years both in the United States and in China.

The late Mr. Robert R. Service was for probably two decades a secretary of the International Committee of Y. M. C. A.'s (headquarters in New York) and served most of that time as a Y. M. C. A. secretary in west China and Shanghai. He had traveled widely in all parts of China, beloved by thousands of Chinese of all classes, Christian and non. My family and I have been for many years intimate associates of the Service family in Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., church, Rotary and Masonic activities in China. In all those organizations the Services, both father and son, always showed sympathetic understanding and had a genius for friendship with the Chinese people, especially with the underprivileged. These qualities characterize the whole Service family. I had come to know Robert and John Service quite closely in community church and Masonic lodges, and admire them for their genuine humanitarian spirit, their devotion to the Protestant missionary enterprises in China and their love of the Masonic craft.

I write this unsought testimonial, sir, not merely as a gesture of confidence in a brother Mason, nor yet as a friend of Mr. John S. Service and his truly Christian family, but fundamentally as one who keenly appreciates his char-

acter to be utterly alien to anything approaching Communist leanings. Whoever possessed of such a proud educational, cultural, and religious background cannot easily stomach communism, and I am firmly convinced that Mr. Service's professional career negates everything communism stands for. I feel it is due to Mr. Service, as well as to your subcommittee interested in ascertaining the facts of his background, that I address you, for it speaks louder than words his loyalty to his country and the Protestant faith of which all the Services have been such outstanding exponents all their lives.

Very respectfully,

Dr. H. C. Mel.

(Whereupon, at 4:30 p. m., the subcommittee adjourned for the purpose of taking up other matters.)

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE  
LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

MONDAY, JUNE 26, 1950

EXECUTIVE SESSION

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTED UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 231,  
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, following adjournment of the investigative session, at 4:30 p. m. in room G-23, United States Capitol, Senator Millard E. Tydings (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Tydings, Green, and Lodge.

Also present: Mr. Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel for the committee; Mr. Robert Morris, assistant counsel.

Senator LODGE. I can begin now by saying that Senator Green and I were out of the country for 11 days in connection with a subcommittee of two, of which we were members, and during that time the rest of the subcommittee very properly—

Senator GREEN. Are you counting the 11 days from when we went across the Atlantic and came back again?

Senator LODGE. No; that is 12.

During that time, the subcommittee very properly continued with that investigation, and I have now had occasion over the week end to read the transcript of the testimony that was taken while we were away, and I have jotted down some questions which I would like to ask Mr. Morgan, and he can answer them "yes" or "no" if he wants to, or he could answer them more in detail if he wants to.

Does the subcommittee feel that it has clear-cut and convincing answers to the following questions:

1. Why was Jaffe permitted to plead guilty in a brief and almost unnoticed trial and let off with a fine of \$2,500?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator LODGE. You think you have a clear-cut and definite answer to that?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Senator LODGE. Why were charges against Lieutenant Roth, who had been indicted by the Federal grand jury, dismissed by the Government?

Mr. MORGAN. You mean insofar as the Department of Justice was concerned?

Senator LODGE. They did not prosecute Roth.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir. So far as the Navy is concerned, we are trying to get a statement with respect to them.

Senator TYDINGS. Senator Lodge, if you will allow me to interject there, I have written to the Navy Department asking them why, notwithstanding the Department of Justice, did they not do anything. The letter has come into my office this afternoon, but I have not seen it.

Senator LODGE. In the case of Jaffe, is it because the evidence was polluted; is that briefly the reason why?

Mr. MORGAN. In answering the question as I did, Senator, we have obtained a full and complete explanation from the prosecuting officials who handled the case as to why they permitted the case of Jaffe to be disposed of as it was.

To my mind, all that we could hope to obtain on that score is now in our records.

Senator TYDINGS. We could criticize them, but we have got everything.

Senator LODGE. As I understand it, the question of tainted evidence is a question on which lawyers disagree among themselves, and not being a lawyer myself, I feel justified in making the suggestion—

Mr. MORGAN. I will be glad to answer your question.

Senator LODGE. For whatever it is worth, that an outside legal opinion be obtained as to whether evidence was tainted, even though it is obtained pursuant to a search warrant and everything else, which, I understand, was true in the case of the Amerasia documents.

Mr. MORGAN. The handling of the disposition of it insofar as Jaffe is concerned, yes; that was the prime consideration so far as the Justice officials were concerned.

The fact that they regarded the case to be fraught with a taint from beginning to end, which was exposed by reason of an affidavit by Mr. Larsen—

Senator LODGE. And the fact that they obtained a great many documents in a perfectly legal way does not, in your opinion, alter the fact that everything was tainted?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, in that regard, Senator, there is quite a story that we can go into on that, but I will handle it briefly in this way by saying that, as I understand, the Department of Justice's explanation and, of course, that is all we have, there were entries made of the premises which served as the predicate for the acquiring of the legal process employed in entering under a legal guise, and that, as a result of the prior illegal entries, they therefore vitiated the legality of the so-called legal entry. That is their position.

Senator LODGE. I would just like to suggest to you one thing.

Senator TYDINGS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator LODGE. On the record, do not your investigations disclose that they made a number of legal entries into the Amerasia offices?

Senator TYDINGS. No.

Senator LODGE. Does not the record show that they obtained a great many documents by perfectly legal methods?

Mr. MORGAN. The record shows that the searches made in Amerasia headquarters were made incident to an arrest warrant calling for the arrests of Jaffe and Mitchell, let us say those two there.

Those warrants—and I am giving you now the version of the prosecuting officials—those warrants were based on evidence which, in their opinion, was not legally obtained and legally admissible, and inas-

much as the warrants were based on illegal considerations, the warrants themselves were not valid.

Now, going on, the Department of Justice, according to the testimony of officials who have here testified, authorized the prosecution of these defendants, knowing those facts on the theory, I presume, that what the defendants did not know would not hurt them. The case went on on that theory until one of the defendants, Larsen, found out what had happened, and filed a motion to quash. That motion, filed by Larsen, was the predicate for the action that was taken with respect to Jaffe and with respect to Larsen.

Senator LODGE. Not being a lawyer, I am aware of the fact that lawyers disagree violently as to whether or not it is true that the fact that some evidence is obtained illegally vitiates all the rest of it, and I suggest that we be in a stronger position if we had a committee of lawyers who are in active practice of the law, to pass on that question.

Mr. MORGAN. In that connection, Senator, when I refer to having in our records the story, I do not mean that they necessarily were right; I mean that we have the conditions and considerations which they say was responsible for the action which they took.

Senator LODGE. Have you got the answer to the question of why Larsen was let off with a "slap on the wrist?"

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; we have the answers to that.

Senator LODGE. Have you got the answer to why the charges against those involved in the Amerasia case changed from conspiracy to violate the espionage statutes by stealing highly confidential Government documents to a simply charge of conspiracy to remove Government records illegally?

Mr. MORGAN. We have that evidence in great detail.

Senator LODGE. Have you the answer to what methods were used to extract secret documents from the files of the State, War, and Navy Departments, the OSS, and the Office of War Information?

Mr. MORGAN. I believe, pursuant to a specific question propounded by Senator Tydings, we have the FBI's complete version of it.

Senator LODGE. Have you got the answer to the question of what evidence was presented to the two grand juries?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. We have completely reviewed the proceedings of both grand juries; and in that connection, somewhere along the line someone has suggested that the proceedings of the first grand jury were missing. That is in error. We have reviewed the complete record of both grand juries.

Senator LODGE. Why was the first grand jury dismissed and the case taken before a second grand jury, despite the fact that Federal grand juries frequently are extended over their regular terms for uncompleted business?

Mr. MORGAN. We have a complete answer with respect to that, if you would like for me to give it to you.

Senator LODGE. Was that the answer that Mr. Hitchcock gave, that the weather was insufferably hot?

Mr. MORGAN. We have the answer of Mr. Hitchcock and also the answer of Mr. McInerney.

Senator LODGE. Well, the weather was pretty hot out in the Philippines where the soldiers were fighting.

Have you got the answer to the question as to why the Department of Justice felt that it had sufficient evidence to go before the Federal grand jury and move for an indictment against the six arrested defendants, and then subsequently decide that it did not have the evidence to prosecute the three defendants indicted to the fullest extent of the law?

Mr. MORGAN. The answer to that is part of my previous answer that they were proceeding obviously on the theory of what the defendants did not know would not hurt them.

One of the defendants, however, found out, which, according to the statement of the Department of Justice, destroyed their case.

Senator GREEN. You said what the defendants did not know would not hurt them.

Mr. MORGAN. Perhaps I should have said would not hurt the prosecution.

Senator LODGE. Do you know why the trial of Jaffe and Larsen was held in an unusual Saturday morning court proceeding without any newspapermen being present?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; we have that.

Senator LODGE. Have you the answer to why no evidence was presented to the presiding judge at Jaffe's trial with respect to Jaffe's notorious and well-known Communist affiliations?

Mr. MORGAN. We have the explanation of the responsible officials.

Senator LODGE. Does it satisfy you?

Mr. MORGAN. That is part of an ultimate conclusion that we will have to make, Senator. I think on the basis of the record I will be able to make a conclusion; yes, sir.

Senator LODGE. Why did Special Assistant Attorney General Robert Hitchcock permit the lawyer for Jaffe to make the statement of facts in the court? Is it not true that ordinarily in a guilty plea this is the job of the prosecutor?

Mr. MORGAN. In that regard, as I understand it, Senator, on the day prior to Jaffe's plea, every effort was made to prevent Jaffe's knowing of the fact that Larsen had filed a motion to quash.

As the result of this fact they, the Department officials, contacted Mr. Jaffe through his attorney, and recalled to the attorney's mind the fact that he had suggested several times, in discussions at least, the possibility of a plea, so Jaffe thereupon, with his attorney or, I believe it was just his attorney at this point, proceeded to the Department of Justice. There were Larsen in one room and Jaffe's attorney in another room, and the latter not being acquainted with what Larsen had done. The attorney for Jaffe committed himself positively to plead his client or the defendant Jaffe guilty, with the understanding that the Department of Justice would recommend a substantial fine.

Now, as I understand briefly the position of Mr. Hitchcock in this regard, he did not feel that he could make an arrangement or a commitment, as was made in that case and still go before a judge and literally attempt to "throw the book" at Jaffe, if you see what I mean. That is his position.

Senator LODGE. That they had made a bargain?

Mr. MORGAN. Substantially that; and, of course, I do not know whether you want my observation or comment on that, but arrange-

ments are made certainly every day between United States attorneys and defendants' counsel.

Senator LODGE. Well, with respect to that, during the war, of a United States attorney making a deal with a known Communist like Jaffe, will shock some people.

Mr. MORGAN. That is their explanation.

Senator LODGE. Do you know why Mr. Hitchcock told the court that he could complete the case in 5 minutes?

Mr. MORGAN. We know what Mr. Hitchcock had to say about it.

Senator LODGE. Do not worry, Mr. Chairman, I have not got much more.

According to a Scripps-Howard dispatch dated May 4, 1950,

Louis F. Budenz has notified the Tydings committee that he is prepared to testify about a series of frantic meetings called by the top leaders of the Communist Party after the Amerasia arrests,

and that Budenz specifically mentioned the name of Robert W. Weiner, formerly national treasurer of the Communist Party, as one who attended these meetings and proposed that the Communist Party raise funds for the Amerasia defense.

1. Is Budenz' letter a part of the record?

Mr. MORGAN. Budenz' testimony is part of the record, and I received a letter from Mr. Budenz in which he told me in the letter that Mr. Weiner apparently had a hand in endeavoring to arrange or to assist in financing the defense of Jaffe. That is all I have from him, which we can incorporate in the record at any time.

Senator LODGE. Does not the record also show that Jaffe paid Larsen's fine?

Mr. MORGAN. Larsen's fine?

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. I believe that is Larsen's testimony.

Senator TYDINGS. Larsen testified to that effect.

Senator LODGE. Has the subcommittee called Weiner in connection with the handling of this phase?

Mr. MORGAN. It has not.

Senator LODGE. Do you think we ought to?

Mr. MORGAN. I think, Senator, the determination of that question will rest simply on this basis: We know Jaffe was a Communist; we know it would be logical for the Communist Party to try to help him in this defense. Weiner, being an active Communist, I do not think you would get "boo" out of him.

Senator TYDINGS. I would be willing to concede that he did try to raise money to try to help Jaffe.

Senator GREEN. If he did, you could not believe him.

Mr. MORGAN. That is right.

Senator LODGE. Is it true that at one of these meetings that Budenz refers to, that the suggestion was made that the Communist Party turn on Jaffe and accuse him of spying for Japan? Have you heard that?

Mr. MORGAN. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Didn't Budenz testify to that?

Mr. MORGAN. I believe, Mr. MORRIS, whether it was in his testimony or in his conversation, I believe Mr. Budenz did mention that the Communist Party was trying in every way to disassociate itself from Mr. Jaffe. I think that was substantially it.



Mr. MORRIS. Their first strategy was to say that Jaffe was a Nazi agent or Jap agent.

Mr. MORGAN. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. And then to disclaim him. But then they thought it over and decided to change their tack.

Mr. MORGAN. As I said, Senator, I personally would be convinced that the Communist Party would break its neck to do everything it could for Jaffe. I have no doubt about it. I have no doubt about Jaffe's being a Communist, and I have a pretty good idea that Mr. Jaffe is an espionage agent.

Senator TYDINGS. It would be hard to prove, but I am inclined to agree with you.

Senator LODGE. Something is wrong somewhere, either in the enforcement of the law or the writing of the law, when in the middle of a war we have got to make a bargain and a deal with a character like Jaffe.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator LODGE. On the record, has Jack Stachel, one of the eleven convicted Communists in New York last year, been contacted with respect to his knowledge of the Amerasia case?

Mr. MORGAN. When Mr. Budenz testified he suggested the calling of Browder, Field, and Stachel, with a view to going into the question of Mr. Lattimore's having Communist connections.

We subpoenaed all three of them. Field and Browder, as you know, both testified, and, in pertinent parts of their testimony, declined to answer questions.

With respect to the Stachel subpoena, his doctor certified to the court that he has a very bad heart attack, confining him to his home. Now, of course, I do not know how much credence we can place in that. All the Communists up there sought to obtain permission from the court to make a Nation-wide tour, of those that were prosecuted successfully, and incidentally, I submitted an affidavit in which I stated that Stachel has said that he had been confined to his home, and I understand that was part of the reason for the court's denying the request to permit them to go about the country.

Now, insofar as Stachel himself, as a witness here is concerned, I think, Senator, that he has probably been the leading Communist in the country, at least openly, the most effective one, and I do not think we have any hope of getting anything from him. I personally would recommend against calling him or insisting upon compliance with the subpoena.

Senator LODGE. Have you seen Budenz' testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, that Lieutenant Roth was instructed to contact Alger Hiss to see if the latter could use some influence in the case? Has the subcommittee looked into this angle of the case?

Mr. MORGAN. That is testimony of Mr. Budenz?

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. I had not seen it, and if there is such testimony, I certainly would like to get it.

Senator TYDINGS. We will get it.

Senator LODGE. I suggest you look it up.

Mr. MORGAN. May I ask, for my guidance and assistance, do you know anything about it, Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. No.

Mr. MORGAN. I am not prying, but what is the source of this?

Senator LODGE. My assistants developed this. Ask them.

Senator TYDINGS. The House Un-American Activities Committee.

Senator LODGE. According to Budenz' testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, Lieutenant Roth was instructed to contact Alger Hiss to see if the latter could use some influence in the case.

Why have we not called General Donovan to tell what he knows about the case?

Mr. MORGAN. I will answer it to this extent, Senator. Two of the members of our staff interviewed General Donovan concerning the Amerasia case, and the general advised them, asked them if they had talked to Mr. Van Buren, and they said they had not. He said that they should talk to him, that he knew about it as much as he, General Donovan, did. We did call Mr. Van Buren.

Senator TYDINGS. He did not know anything.

Senator LODGE. I read his testimony.

Mr. MORGAN. We have the complete memorandum concerning the interview of General Donovan, which I want to put in the record before our proceedings are concluded.

Senator LODGE. Is that illuminating? Is there much in it?

Mr. MORGAN. Very little, Senator.

Senator LODGE. Why have we not asked J. Edgar Hoover for his opinion respecting the evidence in the case, and for confirmation of the reported statement that he felt that the FBI had an airtight case?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, with respect to the matter of opinion, of course, I would be very happy to see Mr. Hoover appear at any time, but I think, consistent with the rather settled policy of the FBI, he would decline to express an opinion with respect to legal matters affecting a case in which his men had developed the facts.

I think that is rather a consistent policy, and probably a rather good one.

Now, with respect to this 100-percent airtight matter, all I know about that, of course, is the letter which Mr. Peurifoy read into our record, in which Mr. Hoover, according to the record, is supposed not to have made this statement.

Now, if it is regarded as of paramount significance, and the committee wants Mr. Hoover, my felings would be purely in the middle on that. We know all the facts about the case, and irrespective of any man's opinion as to what it might be, and Mr. Hoover's opinion would certainly be a good one, of course, I think we, having the facts as we do, certainly ought to be able to pass judgment on those facts.

Senator LODGE. Well, it seems to me that the Amerasia case, everyone must admit, the Amerasia case, marked a failure in a great many respects, and Mr. Hoover's opinion as to why the failure existed in certain respects, would be interesting and, of course, I would be tremendously interested to know Mr. Hoover's opinion as to the credibility of some of these people.

Senator TYDINGS. He would not give it to you, I believe.

Senator LODGE. Now, the credibility of Budenz' opinion on that, what his credibility is. I do not know what basis he would have for expressing an opinion on that.

Mr. MORGAN. Incidentally, we requested an estimate of Mr. Budenz' credibility from the Department of Justice, and they have replied that a man's credibility or a witness' credibility must be determined incident to each particular proceeding; in other words, they would not pass judgment on that, and that, of course, would not indicate that he was not a highly creditable and credible witness at all, but that has been their position, I am quite sure it is rather consistent with their policy.

Senator GREEN. It would be unfortunate to call him and not get any information from him at all, a declination of one kind or another.

Senator LODGE. Well, I am not going to admit that that is what would happen. I think if he came up here he would be obliged to inform us.

Senator GREEN. That is the policy of the Department, we have been told over and over again.

Senator LODGE. I have been told that the policy of the Department is not to make any conclusions.

Mr. MORGAN. As to the picture here, I think all matters relating to situations of this kind are clear. I think Mr. Morris approached the FBI on some questions, and I believe they had to clear them with the Department of Justice, and then get the release, so on that score I think the position has been very consistent, I believe. I do know it was for the 8 years I was with the FBI, that the Bureau, by reason of the fact that it is an investigative fact-finding body, declines to assume to pass judgment upon those facts, saying that is a responsibility of the prosecuting officials. They have always insisted that the very minute they assume to pass judgment on facts they become not an investigative agency, but a body that might conceivably be fraught with some of the aspects of a gestapo, which Mr. Hoover has certainly tried to avoid.

Senator LODGE. I do not want him to be a gestapo, but I think there is something less than satisfactory—

Senator GREEN. That is the distinction. One draws the facts, and the other prosecutes.

Senator LODGE. I have never studied the set-up of the gestapo, I am not an expert on it, and I do not know anything about it. But I certainly think there is something less than a satisfactory handling in reading these files, and finding this serious allegation of the person, and reading through the file, and there is no confirmation of it. I think they could confirm some of these facts without becoming a gestapo.

Mr. MORGAN. Are you referring now to the Amerasia situation or the loyalty files?

Senator LODGE. I am off that.

Now, the record indicates, as I read it, that immediately after the Amerasia raid there was this apparently concerted outbreak in certain newspapers by certain writers that the issue involved was the freedom of the press, and it came very quickly and with apparent unanimity, indicating some sort of teamwork. Have you looked into that?

Mr. MORGAN. You mean about the press coverage of the Amerasia case?

Senator LODGE. About the unanimity of the argument, and the unanimity of timing.

Mr. MORGAN. Senator, I have not the slightest doubt but what every leftist publication or every pinkish publication in this country went all-out to try to present this case in the least significant light.

Senator LODGE. And that they were tipped off from a central source?

Mr. MORGAN. You mean after the arrests were made?

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. I have not sought to make any inquiry with respect to the press coverage, but I would not have the slightest doubt but what they would try to play it down in every conceivable way.

Senator LODGE. Have you found out who was responsible for permitting Roth to obtain a commission in the United States Navy?

Mr. MORGAN. That is what we were trying to find out.

Senator TYDINGS. I called the Secretary of the Navy today and told him I had had an inquiry down there for 2 weeks, and I was very disappointed. We are getting along with our hearing very well, and I wanted to get it in. He said, "It is a funny thing; it is on my desk now, and I wanted to make sure that we answered your queries thoroughly and comprehensively, and that has caused the delay." He said, "It will be up there today."

Senator LODGE. Have you got any information concerning Roth's connection with the Communist Party?

Mr. MORGAN. We have in the record—it is incorporated by reference in the record—the FBI testimony indicating the nature of Roth's affiliation with Communist groups and organizations.

I think you will also find, Senator, that in the Hobbs' committee testimony an indication of the fact that a man's having Communist connections at the time of the war was not a bar, strange as it may seem, to his obtaining a commission in the Navy.

Senator LODGE. Have you obtained yet that military evaluation that I requested several weeks ago of the importance of these Amerasia documents?

Mr. MORGAN. No; we have not obtained a military evaluation of them, Senator. The staff, however, has reviewed every one of them.

Senator LODGE. Well, what I wanted, when the Department of Justice came in here and made the astounding statement that in their opinion these documents were nothing more or less than teacup gossip, and they were silly, I requested that we obtain naval opinion from the Navy on the naval documents, and Army opinion on the Army documents to see whether they were silly or not, and I think it is very pertinent in view of the fact that the Department of Justice took it upon itself to pass expert judgments on military matters.

Mr. MORGAN. Senator, if I may be pardoned an explanation here, I would like to give it as to that.

The crime which these people were charged with was a conspiracy under section 88 of the code. The punishment for conspiracy, the maximum punishment under the law, is 2 years which, incidentally, happens also to be the maximum punishment for conspiracy to steal national defense documents.

Now, any conspiracy to violate any Federal law, no matter what it is, is 2 years.

Under the one statute they had to prove as an element of proof that these documents related to the national defense.

They had another statute under which they did not have to undertake this burden of proof, and yet under either statute they could secure the same punishment for the defendant.

They, therefore, laid the predicate for their prosecution on that statute which did not require the element of proof with respect to the character of the documents. In other words, they just side-stepped the problem of having to make that additional order of proof, and that was done, as I understand it, by reason of their feeling that in all probability there were a great many of these documents which they could not sustain as national defense documents in the mind of a court or in the mind of a jury. That is the only way, as I understand it, in which this question of the character of the documents enters the picture, because I think everybody admits that Jaffe et al. had no business with the documents.

Senator LODGE. Well, I think, leaving out the legal technicalities, it must be obvious to everyone that it is a matter of the utmost importance as to whether these documents were important documents or whether they were silly teacup-gossip documents.

It seems to me that is fundamental in this whole thing, because if they were silly, we are wasting our time, because at the very opening of this meeting, Mr. McInerney made that statement; it was extraordinary statement to make because it, in effect, says "That we in the Department of Justice are better qualified to pass on military documents than the military."

I think it is very important to get military statements on these documents to see whether they are important or not.

Mr. MORGAN. You see, the only consideration from the prosecuting standpoint that entered into the Department of Justice's view of the case was whether or not these documents related to the national defense. Now, the case of Goren versus the United States has laid down what a document is which is related to the national defense, and by that standard, with which the Department of Justice was confronted, they felt they could not sustain a substantial number of these documents, as such. For that reason they laid the predicate for the prosecution without having to go into it.

Senator TYDINGS. The burden of proof.

Senator LODGE. Why did he come in here the first day and presume to belittle it?

Mr. MORGAN. He did so, Senator Lodge, in the light of the requirement of the law that they be national defense documents. I think that is what he was doing, and that was what Mr. McInerney, I am sure, was talking about. It is what he so said today.

Senator LODGE. When the law lays down a criterion as to what is a national defense document—

Mr. MORGAN. The law requires that the documents, to come under that particular portion of the statute, must relate to the national defense documents. Whether they are or not documents relating to the national defense, as the statute requires, is a question of fact to be determined by a jury or by a court sitting without a jury. The case of Goren versus the United States is, perhaps, the leading case on what it takes to constitute a national defense document and, I think, Senator, upon reading that case you will find and agree that a very great many of these documents, while significant, could not be sus-

tained as national defense documents—as documents relating to the national defense.

Mr. MORRIS. Even if some of them were?

Senator GREEN. Yes. Why was it necessary to prove all of them were?

Mr. MORRIS. If some of them were, that is enough.

Senator TYDINGS. What Mr. Morgan is commenting on is not that some of them were not.

Senator GREEN. If any of them were that would have proved a case.

Senator LODGE. If the War Department had decided that a document ought to be top secret would that not tend to persuade the average member of the jury?

Mr. MORGAN. In *Goren versus the United States* the court pointed out quite clearly that the fact of the classification did not ipso facto make the document one relating to the national defense. You see, that is something that has to be established by independent proof and, as I have said, the Department of Justice sought to avoid having to make that additional proof when they had two statutes under each of which there could be meted out the same punishment to the defendant. That is what I am trying to say.

So, in contemplation of the punishment possible, the question of the documents becomes in that sense an academic one because the punishment would have been the same in either event.

Senator LODGE. Why does he want to run down the importance of the documents?

Mr. MORGAN. I am not here to defend Mr. McInerney, but he was doing that to explain to us just why it was that they changed the predicate of the prosecution from one section, section 31, to the section dealing with embezzlement, because the first section required the establishing as an independent element that the document related to the national defense.

Senator TYDINGS. And the penalty was the same no matter which one of those statutes they were tried under.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. McInerney not being here, in fairness it should be said that his answer was right in line with the question we asked. Why was it that they shifted from the conspiracy to commit espionage under section 31, to conspiracy to embezzle documents, and that was part of the testimony in explaining why he did it.

Senator LODGE. I certainly would like to get a military judgment on those documents.

Mr. MORGAN. I personally, Senator, am willing to concede for the purpose of our present discussion that every one of them might have been a military document.

Senator LODGE. All through that record you can see page after page after page—I have jotted it down wherever it occurred—almost every witness except Mr. McInerney says that these documents were important.

Mr. MORGAN. It is all through the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. MORGAN. From reading the grand jury testimony apparently Mark Gayn made quite a point of the fact that it was a common practice to pass on information of this kind. As I understand it, the grand jury was apparently impressed with that, at least they did

not indict him, and I think that they—probably if the grand jury had the job of also taking those documents and making the additional finding that they related to the national defense in contemplation of such testimony, that it might have been difficult securing the indictments that they did secure. I do not know that to be true, but it is merely in consideration of the question you just asked. Of course, I do not know that, it is only a thought.

Senator GREEN. Then it was a mistake in bringing the first indictment.

Mr. MORGAN. No. You see, there was no first indictment. At the time the complaints were filed for the warrants of arrest, they were filed charging conspiracy to violate that section, conspiracy to purloin documents relating to the national defense.

At that time they felt that was the theory of the case they wanted to proceed on. As they studied the documents subsequently, they felt they wanted to avoid taking on that burden.

Senator TYDINGS. And the penalty was the same in both cases.

Senator LODGE. So far as I am concerned the thing was terribly important. It is important in two things. I think most of the documents themselves are intrinsically important and could have involved life and death.

Mr. MORGAN. There were important documents; no question about it.

Senator LODGE. There was no earthly reason for coming up here and telling us that they were not important.

Secondly, the thing was important because it opened up probably the most used source for obtaining documents for foreign governments, and it gave the other departments leads that were useful to them in preventing the purloining of documents for foreign governments in the future; so I think the thing is very important, and no good purpose is served by trying to pretend that it is not.

On May 26 Hitchcock testified that Gayn, one of the six that were arrested in the Amerasia case, had received Government documents from two Government employees identified as George Edward Taylor, Deputy Director of Area 3, OWI, and from Taylor's subordinate, Elizabeth Downing Barker.

Hitchcock also said at the time Gayn was arrested, the FBI seized 60 items, of which 22 were Federal Communications Commission reports and about 20 were copies of State Department papers.

Has the subcommittee further pursued this line of inquiry, particularly with reference to the two Government employees named, with a view of determining whether any leads into the State Department could be established?

Mr. MORGAN. Both of those parties testified before the second grand jury, and we have reviewed their testimony. Mrs. Barker testified that she did give those documents, OWI documents, to Gayn, declassifying them as she did.

The other documents, according to the evidence, Gayn probably obtained from Jaffe. I do not think there is any question that she gave him copies of the others.

Mr. MORRIS. How about Taylor?

Mr. MORGAN. Taylor, there is a discrepancy in the record. Taylor indicated he did not extend such authority to Mrs. Barker, and Mrs. Barker said that he did. Manifestly, of course, the grand jury had

them before it, and apparently chose to believe Mrs. Barker because they did not return a true bill against Gayn.

Senator LODGE. Taylor and Barker are still in the Government?

Mr. MORGAN. Not to my knowledge either way; I do not know.

Mr. MORRIS. There is some testimony today about George Taylor.

Senator LODGE. Does it not seem to you that we ought to call Mrs. Blumenthal, who was mentioned several times during the testimony, and who purportedly typed for Jaffe the Government documents?

Mr. MORGAN. I think we have the testimony of Inspector Gurnea on that to the effect that it was admitted that Mrs. Blumenthal did type the documents, but it was felt she would probably be better in the capacity of a helpful witness rather than a defendant. We have that available to us.

Senator LODGE. Have you tried to find out why Lieutenant Roth was not court-martialed by the Navy for his complicity?

Senator TYDINGS. Yes; I have asked for it. It is all in this letter. I wrote 2 weeks ago and asked them why they had been taking all this time.

Senator LODGE. There were thousands of people who were court-martialed for infinitely less.

Senator TYDINGS. He should have been court-martialed whether he was guilty or not.

Senator LODGE. When Larsen's motion to suppress was served on the Department of Justice, has the subcommittee determined whether the FBI was asked to prepare a report of the facts concerning the seizure of the documents for the use of the Department of Justice in litigating this question?

Mr. MORRIS. May I at that point say, Senator, that I have addressed an inquiry to the chairman of the committee, and I understand the inquiry has been passed on to the Justice Department. I have renewed it three times that we get the FBI memorandum which was a refutation of the affidavits set forth by Larsen's attorney.

Mr. MORGAN. Well now, my recollection of that, Mr. Morris, is that it was a refutation in this sense: In his affidavit Larsen charged FBI agents with certain conduct which, if true, would be improper on the part of agents effecting an arrest.

The memorandum which the FBI had submitted, as I recall, was a memorandum designed to show the true facts, to show that the acts of the agents were proper under the true facts, and it was not a memorandum directed to the legal sufficiency of Larsen's motion to quash.

Mr. MORRIS. It was directed to the facts—

Mr. MORGAN. It also went into the question, also pointed out, of course, the fact that Larsen had moved from one apartment to another, but I repeat, Mr. Morris, that the FBI's memorandum was directed to facts, with respect to the performance of its agents rather than to the question of the legal sufficiency of Larsen's motion.

Now, I am sure if we make an effort, Mr. Chairman, we can get that memorandum without too much difficulty.

Senator TYDINGS. Of course, I agree with what you said, and we have, in addition to that, the statement of the Department of Justice, which is the FBI, showing the number of times they went into these various places, so that the facts were pretty one-sided on that score.



Mr. MORRIS. But an entrance there, Senator, is not necessarily illegal. That is one of the determinations we have to make here. An entry into a house or into premises by the FBI is not necessarily illegal.

Senator TYDINGS. Without a warrant?

Mr. MORRIS. Without a warrant it is not. If they go into the premises in order to determine the scope or the direction of enemy agents and what they are doing, that is one thing. If they go in to collect evidence to be used in prosecution, that is a second thing. I think that is the distinction.

Senator TYDINGS. I think I will be able to give you in our final testimony a complete picture of all of that, which I am not in a position to give you today because I have not it complete, but I am having that complete picture perfected and it will be right in the middle of the record.

Senator LODGE. Of course, it is customary for the FBI to prepare a report on the occurrence of such a thing.

Mr. MORGAN. I have not seen this complete report except that my understanding of what it is, because I have been told—

Senator LODGE. It does exist?

Mr. MORGAN. But, as I understand it, it was a memorandum of the FBI which it would certainly always want to do if any of its agents was charged by anyone by having indulged in or engaged in improper conduct. I think our problem will be resolved when we get it, as we will.

Senator LODGE. You will have a chance to study it.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator LODGE. Let me ask you this. It is apparent to me from reading this record that the attorneys for the Department of Justice in their heart of hearts thought that Jaffe was guilty, but they thought the evidence was tainted for some legalistic reason. Why did they proceed to go before two grand juries with this evidence in an attempt to obtain this indictment if they thought the evidence was tainted?

Mr. MORGAN. That is what I am trying to tell you. If I understand the testimony, pursuant to a specific question I asked Mr. McInerney, apparently they were operating on the principle, whether rightly or wrongly, that what the defendants did not know about the prior entries would not hurt the prosecution.

When one of the defendants did find out about what happened, then it was quite a different matter.

Senator LODGE. If they had this feeling in their bones, as apparently they did, that Jaffe was guilty, why didn't they try to get him some other way? After all those of us who are not lawyers, we constantly see—take the case of Al Capone; they could not get him from bootlegging, so they got him on his income tax, and we know that when lawyers want to get somebody they have lots of ways.

Mr. MORGAN. Right now we have a way to get Jaffe if all of you gentlemen will sign that contempt citation.

Senator LODGE. It may. Why did they not make any effort to get him on his income tax, do you know? Does the record show?

Mr. MORGAN. No; I do not know that they deliberately set out to get Jaffe after the case was disposed of, as it was.

Senator LODGE. If they felt, as Mr. Hitchcock apparently does feel, from reading the record, why didn't they try it? There was a war on, after all, and fellows were being killed.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, I do not know that the prosecuting officials of the Justice Department, when a case is disposed of not to their liking, I do not know whether they try to set out to get a guy.

Senator LODGE. Look, what they did to Al Capone. There was not even a war on. They got him on his income tax. He had not done anything as bad as these fellows?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know.

Senator LODGE. I am asking you.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know, Senator, why they did not go after him in some other fashion. I do not know whether Mr. Jaffe violated the income-tax laws, and I do not know whether they would have been constantly checking on him.

Senator LODGE. I think they would have told us if they had, don't you think?

Well, the record shows that Jaffe bribed Larsen to get the documents. Why didn't they go after him on a bribery charge? It is illegal to try to bribe somebody.

Mr. MORGAN. As I understand the record, Senator, it would be a characterization of the testimony to say that Larsen was bribed. Larsen has said consistently and insistently that he received no money from it. It is known that Mrs. Larsen typed at Larsen's apartment the documents for which Jaffe gave her money amounting to as much as \$75, \$100 a month.

Senator LODGE. There you are, and certainly it must be against the law to bribe a man who is working in a Government department. Why did they not go after Jaffe for that?

Mr. MORGAN. I doubt, Senator, very much on the basis of the evidence and, of course, it would require a check from the particular standpoint of the bribery statute—I doubt very much if the bribery evidence in this particular case would sustain a bribery count.

Senator LODGE. You certainly will not accomplish anything if you do not try. If you take counsel with fears and try to see all the obstacles, why, of course, nothing is ever accomplished. Thank you.

Mr. MORGAN. Correct.

Senator GREEN. I would like to have a discussion off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

(Whereupon, at 5:25 p. m., the subcommittee adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.)

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE  
LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTED UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 231,  
Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The subcommittee met, at 2 o'clock p. m., in room G-23, United States Capitol, pursuant to adjournment Monday, June 26, 1950, Senator Millard E. Tydings (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Tydings, Green, McMahon, Hickenlooper, and Lodge.

Also present: Mr. Edward P. Morgan, chief counsel of the subcommittee, and Mr. Robert Morris, assistant counsel of the subcommittee.

Senator TYDINGS. We have had prepared citations for contempt with respect to Browder, Field, and Jaffe which will be reported to the full committee for action, with our recommendation that the full committee put them in the hands of the proper officials of the courts for prosecution.

Shall the record show that it is the sense of the committee that that action be taken?

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Senator GREEN. I make that motion.

Senator TYDINGS. Do you second it, Cabot?

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. It has been moved and seconded that the three citations enumerated be approved as the sense of the committee and the full committee be asked to take appropriate action thereon.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now I have something I want to say.

Senator TYDINGS. Do you want to vote on it first?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. No. I want to make a statement before we vote. I think such action should be taken. I am not hostile to it. The only point I want to raise is that the citation, drawn by counsel, was submitted to me the other day, and I didn't sign it at that time because I said I merely wanted to discuss the adequacy of the citation. Now there are only two or three things in there which are referred to, and I wanted to raise the question, because I am not familiar enough with the citation, as to whether or not we should certify the whole record of these people or just hang our hat on one of two things.

Senator TYDINGS. What is your thought?

Mr. MORGAN. The answer to that, Senator, is this. In the body of our report relative to the citation, we certify the entire record and the portions of the testimony quoted by it are illustrative of the predicate which we feel properly lies in their cases. In other words, the entire record is certified, and the United States attorney's office will have it all available incident to prosecution.

Senator TYDINGS. Are the pleadings sufficient?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That is exactly what I am raising. Is the citation for contempt limited solely to the things you set out in our certification as the things we are supposed to sign, which I am perfectly willing to sign if they are adequate, but I merely wanted to be sure that counsel is of the opinion that we are not circumscribing ourselves by only referring to these things by way of illustration.

Senator TYDINGS. Is the citation so drawn that the entire testimony is a part thereof for the purpose of pleadings?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. There can be no question about that under the law.

Senator TYDINGS. That is the answer.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That was the only thing I wanted to be sure was in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. Where are the signatures you want?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I would like the record to show that we are not limiting ourselves to two or three specific illustrations or citations.

Senator TYDINGS. Let's move along. What is your next problem?

Senator GREEN. We haven't put the motion to a vote yet.

Senator TYDINGS. All those in favor will signify by saying "Aye."

(Chorus of "ayes.")

Senator TYDINGS. Opposed?

(No response.)

Senator TYDINGS. Present are Senators McMahon, Green, Lodge, Hickenlooper, and Tydings. All votes are in the affirmative.

Mr. MORGAN. Pursuant to various requests we have made of different agencies of the Government, we have received certain replies, most of which are addressed to you as the chairman of the committee. I think that this material all has relevancy to these proceedings and, with your permission, I would like to indicate, one by one, what they are and, if agreeable, incorporate them in the record.

Pursuant to a request made of the Department of Justice by the chairman relative to some conflicting information which we have concerning the entries and the character thereof made by representatives of the Department of Justice in the course of the Amerasia investigation, we now have a reply, dated June 13, 1950, to the chairman, indicating the occasions upon which the premises of Amerasia, Mark Gayn's residence, the apartment of Kate Louise Mitchell, the apartment of Philip Jaffe, the apartment of Larsen and Andrew Roth were entered.

(This letter is retained in the confidential files of the committee.)

Mr. MORGAN. At one point in our record, an inquiry was made by one of the members of the committee—as I remember, it was you, Senator Lodge; correct me if I am wrong—concerning the departmental observation relative to the credibility of Mr. Louis F. Budenz.

We have a letter, dated May 16, 1950, addressed to the chairman, as follows:

Reference is made to your letter of May 5, 1950, to the Attorney General requesting the Department's observations concerning the credibility of Louis F. Budenz as a witness.

It is the Department's view that the tribunal before which a witness appears is and should be the complete judge of the credibility of the witness, since this judgment is based upon the evidentiary matter involved and the numerous elements involved in the confrontation process.

You will, I believe, completely understand the Department's regret that it cannot be of assistance to you in your evaluation of the testimony of Mr. Budenz.

PEYTON FORD,

*The Assistant to the Attorney General.*

Senator LODGE. I do not understand it at all. I think it is a most unhelpful answer. I don't agree with it, and I think it is a great pity we can't have J. Edgar Hoover before us. I made the statement many times and I repeat it now: I regard that letter as most uncooperative.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I might say it is a remarkable thing that the Department of Justice will put this man on the witness stand and say to the jury that this man is to be believed as a part of the prosecution of this case and then say in a letter that they will not pass on his credibility.

Senator TYDINGS. I understand it is a time-honored custom of the Department of Justice not to pass on the credibility of any person who gives information.

Senator LODGE. Some customs are held a little too long. I think it is about time they changed that custom.

Senator TYDINGS. You have a point there, but I am just passing on to you the facts. They say they are an investigative agency, not a fact-finding agency. Go ahead, Mr. Morgan. Do you have all this to go through?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. We had better get along, then. Go ahead.

Mr. MORGAN. Maybe we could expedite this if I would characterize the documents, unless there is an objection, and we will just let the reporter copy them.

Senator TYDINGS. All right, do that, then.

Mr. MORGAN. We have here a letter dated May 4, 1950.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Just before you go into that, did any of you gentlemen receive a copy of a letter, either from the prosecuting attorney in New York or one of them to Mr. Budenz or to somebody else, stating his belief as to the credibility of Mr. Budenz? It seems that I got a copy of it.

Senator TYDINGS. I haven't got any copy that I recall, but even if I had, it would only be opinion evidence. It wouldn't be a fact. His credibility here will have to be judged by us, not in some other case.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am only talking with reference to this letter of the Justice Department. I have seen a copy of a letter from the prosecuting attorney.

Senator TYDINGS. To whom was it addressed?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think it was addressed to Budenz. I think he sent me a copy of it and said he sent you a copy of it.

Senator TYDINGS. I don't recall getting it.

Mr. MORRIS. I think, Senator, in the distribution of it, that was the letter which was addressed to you.

Senator TYDINGS. Put it in the record, if you have it. I have no objection to it. Put it in the record, if any of you have it.

Mr. MORGAN. To make clear why this was read into the record, it was for the purpose of clearing up a specific request on the record relative to the Department of Justice. That, of course, is why I incorporated it, to clear that up.

Senator LODGE. It doesn't clear that up at all, I am sorry.

Mr. MORGAN. That is the best we could do.

I have here a letter from John Foster Dulles, making reference to certain testimony of Freda Utley relative to the employment of Alger Hiss at a time coincident with Mr. Dulles' association with the Carnegie Foundation, which he has requested that we incorporate in our record.

Senator TYDINGS. He has?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. Without objection, I assume that is satisfactory, Mr. Chairman?

Senator TYDINGS. We will read any document in full that you want, but unless you want them read, we will just designate what some of them are and let them go in.

Senator HICKENLOPER. Does this letter take issue with what she said?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. It is short. I will read it.

Senator TYDINGS. All right.

Mr. MORGAN. It is dated May 4, 1950:

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I am informed that on May 1, Freda Utley in her testimony before your Foreign Relations Subcommittee stated that I had recommended the appointment of Alger Hiss as president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace at a time when I had been furnished with information that Hiss was a Communist.

That is untrue. The first intimation I received that Hiss might have Communist affiliations came to me after, not before, his election on December 9, 1946.

If you or any member of your subcommittee deems the matter of sufficient importance, I should be happy to appear personally and, under oath, to state the facts.

In any event you may, perhaps, put this letter into the record.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

Senator TYDINGS. That has nothing to do with this case. It is clearing up his own position.

Let us go off the record for a second.

(Off the record.)

Senator TYDINGS. On the record.

Mr. MORGAN. Next is a letter, dated May 19, 1950, addressed to Senator Tydings.

Senator LODGE. From whom?

Mr. MORGAN. From the State Department. It reads as follows:

In accordance with your request, this is to advise that the records of the Department have been thoroughly checked and it has been ascertained that the following individuals, whose names are included on the McCarthy list, have never been employed by or connected with the Department of State in any way.

Then I will give you the numbers corresponding to their names as they appear on the subpoena list of the so-called 81. They are numbers 29, 19 and 20. This letter is signed John E. Peurifoy.

Senator TYDINGS. How many of them are there?

Mr. MORGAN. Three. If you would like the names off the record, I will give them to you.

Senator TYDINGS. No, I don't think it is important, unless the committee wants them.

Mr. MORGAN. Pursuant to a request made of me by Mr. Morris relative to appearances of Lattimore before the Foreign Service Institute, I have a letter here, dated May 25, 1950, from the State Department, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I understand that your subcommittee is interested in learning of any occasions on which Mr. Owen Lattimore has lectured for the Foreign Service Institute. Mr. Lattimore's only lecture at the Foreign Service Institute was one given on June 5, 1946 as part of the "Meet the Public" program of the Department's Office of Public Affairs, as referred to in my letter to you of April 17, 1950.

His only other connection with the Institute arose from the Department's contract with Johns Hopkins University in relation to the University's Mongol language project, which is also covered in the letter of April 17.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. PEURIFOY.

I might say, in passing, that I have the letter of April 17, which I will incorporate here in a few moments. This letter I would like to have incorporated, without objection.

(The letter, submitted by Mr. Morgan, is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
Washington, April 17, 1950.

The Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Following Senator McCarthy's statement of March 21 that a top Russian espionage agent, whom he privately identified as Mr. Owen Lattimore, was an employee or consultant of the State Department, I submitted to your subcommittee a brief statement of Mr. Lattimore's connections with this Department, as revealed by a careful check of our personnel records. Since Mr. Lattimore has been publicly identified and since there has been considerable public discussion concerning his relationship with the Department, it is now appropriate to give in greater detail the instances of connections between Mr. Lattimore and the Department. Without any intention of reflecting on Mr. Lattimore and for the purpose of setting the record straight, I believe I should state that Mr. Lattimore does not have a desk in the Department of State nor access to its files, and is neither an employee nor a top adviser of the Department. These are the facts:

On October 15, 1945, Mr. Owen Lattimore was appointed as an economic adviser to the United States Reparations Mission to Japan. He served with the mission until February 12, 1946. While on this assignment he was paid out of the Department's International Conference funds.

Mr. Lattimore was one of 28 persons to lecture on a program known as Meet the Public, which was given at the Department's Foreign Service Institute. He gave one lecture on June 5, 1946. This program was initiated by the Department's Office of Public Affairs and was designed to bring before departmental personnel the viewpoints of various persons who were working on, or interested in, foreign affairs. In this capacity, Mr. Lattimore was not an employee of the Department and received no remuneration. The following were the speakers on this program:

Senator J. William Fulbright  
Mr. Ernest K. Lindley, chief of the Washington bureau of Newsweek  
Mr. Charles Bolte, chairman of the American Veterans' Committee  
Congressman Jerry Voorhis  
Prof. Owen Lattimore, director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations, Johns Hopkins University  
Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Williams College  
Mr. Herbert Elliston, editor of the Washington Post  
Mr. Eugene Meyer, president of the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development  
Dr. Jacob Viner, professor of economics, Princeton University  
Dr. Harold Lasswell, professor of law, Yale University  
Mr. Wallace Deuel, editor of the Chicago News

Senator Wayne Morse  
 Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, vice chairman of Americans United for World Government, Inc.  
 Mr. James M. Landis, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board  
 Senator Warren Austin  
 Dr. Arthur Compton, chancellor of Washington University, St. Louis  
 Mrs. Vera Micheles Dean, editor and research director of the Foreign Policy Association  
 Mr. Kermit Ely, director of education and research, Congress of Industrial Organizations  
 Mr. Hamilton Owens, editor of the Baltimore Sun (and Sun papers)  
 Prof. Frank Tannenbaum, Columbia University  
 Mr. Gardner Murphy, American Psychological Association  
 Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, vice president of Georgetown University and regent of the School of Foreign Service  
 Mr. David Lawrence, editor of the United States News and of the World Report  
 Mr. Robert Watt, international representative of the American Federation of Labor  
 Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt  
 Dr. Dexter Perkins, professor of Latin American affairs, University of Rochester  
 Congressman Mike Mansfield  
 Dr. James P. Baxter, president of Williams College

On October 6, 7, and 8, 1949, Mr. Lattimore, following preliminary correspondence with the Department of State, was one of a group of 25 private individuals participating in a round-table discussion arranged by the Office of Public Affairs for the purpose of exchanging views on United States foreign policy toward China. As a member of this group Mr. Lattimore was not an employee of the Department and received no compensation but was reimbursed for expenses. This round-table discussion followed a solicitation of written views on the same topic from a larger group in response to which the written views of 31 private individuals were received and analyzed. Some of the members, including Mr. Lattimore, were in both groups. Both the written views received and the transcript of the round-table discussions were made available as some of the background material for consideration by Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick, Mr. Everett Case, and Ambassador Jessup, who had been requested by the Secretary to review United States policy toward the Far East. The 31 who expressed views initially in writing were:

Former Consul General Joseph W. Ballantine, now at Brookings Institution  
 Prof. Hugh Borton, Columbia University  
 Former President Isaiah Bowman, Johns Hopkins University  
 Dr. A. J. Brumbaugh, American Council on Education, Washington  
 Former Ambassador William Bullitt  
 Former Under Secretary Castle  
 Former Consul John A. Embry  
 Prof. Rupert Emerson, Harvard University  
 Dr. Charles B. Fahs, New York City  
 Prof. John K. Fairbanks, Harvard University  
 Dr. Huntington Gilchrist, New York City  
 Prof. Carrington Goodrich, Columbia University  
 Former Under Secretary Grew  
 Col. Robert A. Griffin, former Deputy Administrator, ECA, China  
 Former Ambassador Stanley K. Hornbeck  
 Roger Lapham, former Administrator, ECA, China  
 Prof. Kenneth S. Latourette, Yale University  
 Prof. Owen Lattimore, Johns Hopkins University  
 Oliver C. Lockhart, Export-Import Bank of Washington  
 Walter H. Mallory, Council on Foreign Relations  
 Prof. Wallace Moore, Occidental College, Los Angeles  
 Prof. Edwin O. Reischauer, Harvard University  
 C. A. Richards, Economic Cooperation Administration  
 Former Minister Walter S. Robertson, Richmond, Va.  
 Dr. Lawrence K. Rosinger, New York City  
 Mr. James Rowe, Washington  
 Mrs. Virginia Thompson (Adoloff), New York City  
 Prof. Amry Vandenbosch, University of Kentucky  
 Prof. Karl A. Wittfogel, Columbia University  
 Prof. Mary Wright, Stanford University  
 Admiral Yarnell



The 25 who attended the round-table discussions were:

Joseph W. Ballantine, the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.  
 Bernard Brodie, department of international relations, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.  
 Claude A. Buss, Director of Studies, Army War College, Washington, D. C.  
 Kenneth Colegrove, department of political science, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.  
 Arthur G. Coons, president, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Calif.  
 John W. Decker, International Missionary Council, New York, N. Y.  
 John K. Fairbank, committee on international and regional studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 William R. Herod, president, International General Electric Co., New York, N. Y.  
 Arthur N. Holcombe, department of government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Benjamin H. Kizer, Graves, Kizer & Graves, Spokane, Wash.  
 Owen Lattimore, director, Walter Hines Page School of International Relations, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
 Ernest B. MacNaughton, chairman of the board, First National Bank, Portland, Oreg.  
 George C. Marshall, president, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.  
 J. Morden Murphy, assistant vice president, Bankers Trust Co., New York, N. Y.  
 Nathaniel Peffer, department of public law and government, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.  
 Harold S. Quigley, department of political science, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.  
 Edwin O. Reischauer, department of Far Eastern languages, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 William S. Robertson, president, American & Foreign Power Co., New York, N. Y.  
 John D. Rockefeller III, president, Rockefeller Brothers' Fund, New York, N. Y.  
 Lawrence K. Rosinger, American Institute of Pacific Relations, New York, N. Y.  
 Eugene Staley, executive director, World Affairs Council of Northern California, San Francisco, Calif.  
 Harold Stassen, president, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Phillips Talbot, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.  
 George E. Taylor, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.  
 Harold M. Vinacke, department of political science, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio

The following were invited to the round-table October 6, 7, and 8, 1949, but did attend:

W. Langbourne Bond, Pan American Airways, Washington, D. C.  
 Monroe E. Deutsch, provost, University of California  
 Anne O'Hare McCormick, New York Times  
 Morris T. Moore, chairman of the board of Time, Inc.  
 Michael Ross, director, department of international affairs, CIO  
 J. E. Wallace Sterling, president, Stanford University

In order to ascertain whether any facts whatsoever might support Senator McCarthy's assertions that Mr. Lattimore has a desk in the Department, access to its files, and a position as a top adviser on far-eastern affairs, a check has been made with officers of the Department who have been concerned with the Far East, and many of whom have come to know Mr. Lattimore, who is widely regarded as one of the leading experts in this field. Beyond the normal contacts found among persons having a common specialized professional training and interest, this check developed only that Mr. Lattimore, as director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations of Johns Hopkins University, has participated in setting up at Johns Hopkins a Mongolian language project in which the Department is interested. The Department of State, in line with the policy of promoting and utilizing foreign language and other international studies in numerous American universities, has, under authority of Public Law 724 (79th Cong.), entered into a contract with the Johns Hopkins University, pursuant to which it has contributed \$3,200 toward this language project. Very much larger sums have been made available for this project, it is understood, by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Carnegie Foundation. In connection with this project, it was possible to arrange for three Mongol scholars,

including Dilowa Hutuktu, or the "Living Buddha," to enter the United States and work in the Walter Hines Page School in Baltimore. Officers of the Department's Foreign Service Institute have visited the project from time to time, to observe its progress, and a junior member of the Foreign Service staff, a specialist on the Far East, whose salary is \$4,650 a year, is studying at the Walter Hines Page School as part of this project. The end results of the project will be a descriptive grammar of the Mongolian language and other teaching materials in spoken Mongolian.

Mr. Lattimore was recently sent by the Secretariat of the United Nations as a member of a preliminary economic survey mission to Afghanistan. In this capacity, Mr. Lattimore was hired by and responsible to the United Nations and not the Department of State.

Mr. Lattimore does not have a desk in the Department of State, nor does he have access to its files. Of course, in connection with his OWI employment (1942-45) and his 4-month assignment to the Pauley Reparations Mission which terminated February 12, 1946, Mr. Lattimore, like others in such positions, might have been required as part of his duties to consider some official papers from other agencies of the Government, including the Department of State.

These are the facts.  
Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. PEURIFOY,  
*Deputy Under Secretary.*

Senator TYDINGS. Are you numbering these so he can identify them? You want them all in the record here, don't you?

Mr. MORGAN. Without objection, I would like to ask to have incorporated in our record a letter to me of May 2, 1950, from the United States attorney in New York City, pursuant to a request of mine concerning the physical condition of Jacob Stachel, whom we had subpoenaed. As I understand it, we have now determined that we should not seek to require Stachel's appearance, that is, the members of the committee here. I would like to have this in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. Put it in.

(The letter, submitted by Mr. Morgan, is as follows:)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,  
New York, N. Y., May 2, 1950.

Re: *United States v. Foster, et al.*

EDWARD P. MORGAN, Esq.

*Chief Counsel Subcommittee Investigating the State Department,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

SIR: I am in receipt of your letter dated April 28, 1950, relating to the subpoena issued by the Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, directed to Jacob Stachel.

The records of the district court for the southern district of New York disclose that Stachel is represented on appeal from his conviction by George W. Crockett, Jr. I have received information that Stachel is confined to his home under the care of one Dr. Louis Finger, and has been a patient at Mt. Sinai Hospital for a coronary condition. Doctor Finger, of course, has also been physician for William Z. Foster, national chairman of the Communist Party, and has submitted affidavits in his behalf concerning a heart condition.

Stachel is presently under bond which restricts his movements to the southern district of New York. However, I have advised his attorney that I will consent to an order permitting his appearance before the Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee pursuant to the subpoena issued by you.

In addition, there is presently pending before the district court a motion made by Stachel, as one of the 11 defendants seeking a general modification of the bail bonds of all of them, to permit travel throughout the entire United States for the purpose of making speeches and raising funds.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me.  
Respectfully,

IRVING H. SAYPOL,  
*United States Attorney.*

Senator LODGE. I think it is just as important to subpoena Stachel as it is to subpoena Jaffe and Browder. Obviously, he is one of the most important figures in the whole thing. You don't get anything out of these fellows even when you do subpoena them. I think Stachel would be as good a man to subpoena as either Jaffe or Browder.

Senator GREEN. I have no objection to it, but they defy you.

Senator LODGE. I thought they defied us after we subpoenaed them.

Senator GREEN. That is the reason we issue citations.

Senator LODGE. I am not citing Stachel. I am talking about subpoenaing Stachel.

Senator GREEN. I thought he was subpoenaed.

Senator LODGE. No.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. He was.

Senator GREEN. Was he requested to come?

Mr. MORGAN. He was subpoenaed, Senator, and ordered to appear about the same time as Browder.

Senator GREEN. That is what I said; he was subpoenaed, and somebody just contradicted me.

Senator TYDINGS. He was subpoenaed but filed a doctor's certificate of ill health.

Senator GREEN. That is it exactly. He was subpoenaed but couldn't come. When he came, he defied us and refused to answer questions.

Senator McMAHON. Has any check been made as to his condition?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. That has been verified. He was confined at Mt. Sinai Hospital with a heart condition; and, while I imagine that his heart condition is probably not as bad as he might like the world to believe, he apparently has a doctor who is so certifying, and he is confined to his premises by reason of the heart condition.

Senator McMAHON. What do you suggest, Senator?

Senator LODGE. My position has been right along that if we subpoena Browder and Jaffe, we ought to subpoena Stachel.

Senator McMAHON. If we subpoenaed them, what is your position in view of this information, which is new to me?

Senator LODGE. I don't have much faith in a Communist making any excuse that he is too sick. To me, that doesn't carry much weight.

Senator McMAHON. On the theory that all Communists, with which I agree, are, per se, liars.

Senator LODGE. I doubt if we would get much information out of them.

Senator GREEN. I think the only object in asking for a citation in these other cases, because we have been defied by people, is to establish our own self-respect; but, where a man doesn't come because he is sick, that is a different reason.

Senator LODGE. I just doubt whether he is that sick, without knowing anything about it.

Senator GREEN. I know, but I don't think it is the sort of defiance the way the other is, where you order them to answer questions and they refuse. That is a defiance of our rights in the matter.

Senator TYDINGS. We didn't get that other fellow that Senator McCarthy had summoned and brought down here on a plane. He was down here in Washington and went home. We never even got him down here. He was sick, too.

Senator McMAHON. I forgot about that "bird." Where is that "bird"?

Mr. MORRIS. I hear he wants to come down.

Senator TYDINGS. Where did you hear it?

Mr. MORRIS. From him.

Senator TYDINGS. Where is he?

Mr. MORRIS. He is home in Mount Vernon. I spoke to him on the phone.

Senator McMAHON. When?

Mr. MORRIS. I guess it was about 10 days ago.

Senator McMAHON. What did you talk to him about?

Mr. MORRIS. He came and consulted me in connection with his appearance down here. He asked me if, in my opinion, he was in contempt, and I said, "Technically, you are." He submitted a doctor's certificate. So he said, "What are you going to do?" I said, "Certainly, if I were you, I would write to Senator Tydings and tell him you are willing to come down here and testify in executive session."

Senator McMAHON. Did you make any report as assistant counsel to this committee on this conversation?

Mr. MORRIS. To Mr. Morgan? No; I didn't.

Senator McMAHON. To any member of the committee?

Mr. MORRIS. I don't know whether I mentioned it to Senator Hick-enlooper. No; I don't think I did.

Senator McMAHON. Did you mention it to Senator McCarthy?

Mr. MORRIS. No.

Senator McMAHON. Did you mention it to anybody in his office?

Mr. MORRIS. In Senator McCarthy's office? No.

Senator McMAHON. I am rather surprised, because I should think that information concerning a collapsible and disappearing witness—if you thought it was important enough to talk to him and give him advice—would be of some importance. I regret very much that you didn't notify the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORRIS. May I explain a little further?

Senator McMAHON. Sure.

Mr. MORRIS. I haven't been near my law office, I don't know, for a long period of time, and I got phone messages. I noticed he had been trying to reach me. He was trying to consult me sort of independent with respect to my position on the committee. He wanted, as he called it, some friendly advice as to where he stood and everything else. So, the advice I gave him was that he should write to Senator Tydings and say that he is perfectly willing to come down and testify. Now, what caused him to be so upset was the fact he had to testify in open session. Apparently, when he was first served, he was told by Mr. Tyler that he was going to be heard in executive session. When he got down here and saw all the klieg lights, he was very much disturbed, and he said he had an emotional upset; and I believe him, because the guy is very excitable.

Mr. MORGAN. For the record, Mr. Tyler told him he didn't know whether he would appear in executive or open session, but that is neither here nor there.

Mr. MORRIS. I am reporting on Mr. Huber's conversation.

Mr. MORGAN. Just for the record, I want that to be clear.

Mr. MORRIS. I said now that he is well again; that he should come and send a letter to Senator Tydings.

Senator TYDINGS. If he came down here does anybody know what he would testify to? What is the point of bringing him unless he is going to contribute something to the sum total of knowledge essential to form an opinion on the matter before us? We had Mr. Van Buren down here who was widely heralded as a man who could tell everything in God's world, and if he had stayed in New York—he is a hell of a nice fellow—we would have known just as much as we know now. I don't want to take the time to have witnesses come down here unless we know they have got some pertinent information. There is no point in getting him down here, then finding he has nothing to contribute.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, don't misconstrue what I said now. I am answering Senator McMahan's inquiry about Huber. Here is the first time it came up, and I spoke of it as soon as I heard about it. I gave him advice. I didn't think it was in the capacity of assistant counsel. I think he came to me as somebody he could go to for assistance, and I gave him the best advice I could.

Senator McMAHON. How many times have you conferred with him?

Mr. MORRIS. Huber? All together, I must have seen Huber eight times. You see, he was one of the witnesses before the Westchester grand jury.

Senator McMAHON. And you were connected with that case?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Senator McMAHON. Is that where you first met him?

Mr. MORRIS. That is where I first met him—possibly before that, even.

Senator McMAHON. Were most of the meetings in connection with this?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Senator McMAHON. How many times did you confer with him in relation to our matters?

Mr. MORRIS. I would say two.

Senator McMAHON. Would you fix the dates?

Mr. MORRIS. It would be very difficult, Senator.

Senator McMAHON. I don't mean the exact dates. I mean in relation to what was going on in the investigation. In other words, was it before he was supposed to appear before our committee?

Mr. MORRIS. No. I met him once before he was supposed to appear, but I had no part of it or anything else. I just heard that he was going to be one of the witnesses.

Senator TYDINGS. Were you alone when you met him?

Mr. MORRIS. No.

Senator TYDINGS. Who was with you?

Mr. MORRIS. I think Mr. Sokolsky was present and Mr. Kerley. Mr. Sokolsky had nothing to do with it. It happened to be a social gathering at which these people happened to be present.

Senator TYDINGS. Anybody else?

Senator McMAHON. Who is Kerley?

Mr. MORRIS. He testified at the same time. It was a social gathering, Senator. I am trying to think of who else was present.

Mr. MORGAN. Is our question whether or not we are going to call Huber?

Senator TYDINGS. Let us let the thing go.

Mr. MORRIS. I am answering Senator McMahon's question. I am trying to recall who was present. The two that stand out are Kerley and Sokolsky. I don't think he even paid any attention to it.

Senator McMAHON. Where was the meeting?

Mr. MORRIS. It wasn't a meeting. It was at the home of J. B. Matthews, 410 West Twenty-fourth Street. He is a man who had—I know he always used to help me when I was in the Navy.

Senator McMAHON. I know something about Dr. Matthews' background. That was before Kerley was supposed to appear with this man Huber?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, Senator.

Senator McMAHON. Just a few days before?

Mr. MORRIS. No. I think this was probably at least a week before, maybe 2 weeks.

Senator McMAHON. Was that before you became associated with this committee?

Mr. MORRIS. I don't think so; no.

Senator McMAHON. That was when you were associated with this committee?

Mr. MORRIS. I think so.

Senator McMAHON. Did you make that known to the committee, the fact that you had had this meeting in regard to this witness?

Mr. MORRIS. I don't think so, Senator. You see, it was a social gathering. Now, I was not there in my capacity as a counsel of the committee.

Senator McMAHON. But Huber's appearance was discussed; wasn't it?

Mr. MORRIS. Naturally, the Lattimore subject was in all the papers and everyone was talking about it.

Senator McMAHON. Lattimore had already appeared.

Mr. MORRIS. No. I don't know whether he had appeared, but Lattimore's name had been injected into the picture, and people were generally talking about Lattimore and evidence against Lattimore. I saw Huber there and I was rather surprised. I mean I hadn't seen Huber, I suppose, a month or 2 months, 6 weeks, whatever it was. So, I listened to what was going on. I just listened to what it was; that is all. I don't even think I formed a conclusion, because, when I heard that Senator McCarthy had suggested he be called, I was rather surprised. They hadn't consulted me on it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I want to clear up one thing, Brien, if I may.

Senator McMAHON. Sure.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It just runs in my mind, and I want to be clear on it in my own mind. At the time this fellow failed to appear as a witness, or the day before or the day after, in discussing the matter, it seems to me that Mr. Morris may have mentioned that he had seen this fellow. I think maybe I asked him if he had ever seen this fellow that failed to appear, and it runs in my mind that he said he saw him once, or something of the kind. I asked you whether you talked it over with the committee. I think I asked you that. I can't be absolutely certain. However, we were discussing why this fellow didn't appear, and I said, "Who is this 'bird'?" and you may have said to me that you had seen him once. I don't recall whether you did or not.

Senator TRIDINGS. All right, go ahead. What do you want to know?

Senator McMAHON. I may pursue it further a little later.

Senator LODGE. Let me ask you, before Mr. Morgan continues, what is your program for this meeting today, to clean up a lot of loose ends; is that it?

Senator TYDINGS. There are a lot of things, some of which have been requested by me without the authority of the committee. I have been trying to be vigilant, and where things were not buttoned up I have written and tried to get answers to be put in the record. They are all self-explanatory, and a mere reading of them will show where they fit in. There are only one or two things where there could be a question of keeping them out. One of them is that confidential thing from the FBI. My suggestion is—and I want to be perfectly open and aboveboard about it—that Mr. Morgan be authorized to put in all papers that are pertinent to our inquiry which fill in the gaps here. I have written them, without any regard to whether they are pro or con, to get the information, and it is all here. Some of it, I think, would be of value to the committee, but there would be no point, in my opinion, for the committee taking every little letter and going through them, because a lot of them are very routine.

Senator LODGE. I would like to feel that my assistant could go through them and pick out things that he thinks I ought to see.

Senator TYDINGS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MORGAN. These will all be a part of the record.

Senator TYDINGS. They will all be a part of the record, which will be put in your hands.

Senator LODGE. You are going to make copies of this for everybody?

Mr. MORGAN. What I hope to do, Senator, except in those instances where the matter is extremely voluminous, is to indicate to the reporter where it is to be incorporated in the record. This will be retained among the official exhibits in the office downstairs, and when and if we print the record then this can be printed right into the body of the testimony where it is to be inserted.

Senator TYDINGS. What I am doing—I think I ought to notify the committee, and I am sure the committee will want to have it done—I am having the testimony all printed at the Government Printing Office. I haven't gotten any of it yet, but they have it. Now they tell me at this stage of the game, with the session drawing to a close, and with the Congressional Record, they can't give it to me right away, but at least they are working on it, and I am very hopeful of getting it in the not too distant future. What I want to do is to put anything that is pertinent in, so that, when the record does come, you will have the whole picture.

Senator GREEN. I don't understand just what Mr. Morgan meant by "at the proper place in the record." You can't date these back as though they were put in 3 or 4 weeks ago.

Mr. MORGAN. No, Senator. What I mean is this: that if we incorporate them as exhibits they will still have to be printed; and, as a matter of convenience, I think it would be better to have them printed as a part of the testimony record rather than putting them back in as an exhibit as such.

Senator TYDINGS. So that the exhibit will come where it is related to the evidence in the record.

Senator GREEN. I don't think that is right at all. It would seem then, as though we knew it at the time.

Senator TYDINGS. We asked for it at the time.

Mr. MORGAN. Here, for example, is a communication from the Department of Justice pursuant to a specific request made of Mr. McInerney for the Larsen affidavit filed in court.

Senator GREEN. And, at a hearing, it was agreed that it should be furnished us.

Mr. MORGAN. That is right.

Senator GREEN. That is all right. I thought you meant an independent letter from the chairman about some matter that we had discussed at some hearing and, therefore, you would put the whole thing back in that hearing.

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Senator TYDINGS. Frequently during the course of the hearing, Senator Green, if you will recall, we were requested to get some information, which I have endeavored to do, and it should be put in the record at the time the request was made, although it came in later, to show its relativity to what we had under discussion.

Senator GREEN. That is all right.

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead, Mr. Morgan.

Mr. MORGAN. If the chairman desires, I will be happy to read all of this material into the record. However, I would much prefer, if possible—it is all here, available to anyone who wishes to review it—merely to indicate to the stenographer, not necessarily here and now, what it is in order that he can indicate in our record that it has been incorporated as such.

Senator LODGE. I am interested, Mr. Chairman, in having access to these papers while I am still studying this whole subject, so that I can know what is in it to help me in my study.

Senator TYDINGS. You sure can, and it will be made available to you whenever you want it.

Senator LODGE. When can my assistants look through these papers?

Mr. MORGAN. You name it—anytime.

Senator LODGE. Anytime?

Senator TYDINGS. Anytime at all.

Senator LODGE. All right.

Senator TYDINGS. Go ahead.

Mr. MORGAN. I assume, then, that it will not be necessary at this point to incorporate by reading all of this into the record.

Senator TYDINGS. I don't see any point in it, but any member of the committee, anytime, ought to be able to go through this and see anything that we have here.

Mr. MORGAN. Pursuant to the committee's approval of this action, I am at this point incorporating in the record all of the various items which we thus far have collected in the office of the staff.<sup>1</sup>

(Whereupon, at 3:50 p. m., the committee adjourned.)

<sup>1</sup>These items are included in the appendix to the record at pp. 1756 to 2509.



## APPENDIX

### EXHIBIT No. 1

[Daily Worker, February 21, 1940]

#### SIGNERS OF PROTEST

The following outstanding Americans, writers, poets, playwrights, educators, judges, critics, and public officials signed the letter to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson protesting the attacks upon the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and condemning the war hysteria now being whipped up by the Roosevelt administration:

Elliot Paul	S. L. M. Barlow	Dr. W. B. Cannon
Ernest Hemingway	Marguerite Zorach	Reuben Ottenberg
Jay Allen	William Zorach	C. Fayette Taylor
Vincent Sheenan	Prof. H. P. Fairchild	Countee Cullen
Paul Robeson	Kyle Crichton	Harvey O'Connor
John T. Bernard	Anna Louise Strong	Hon. Paul J. Kern
Louis B. Boudin	S. John Block	Nora Benjamin
Z. Chaffee, Jr.	Anita Block	Bennett Cerf
Muriel Draper	Dr. E. M. Bluestone	Dorothy Brewster
Queñten Reynolds	Arthur Kober	Florina Lasker
George Marshall	George H. Stover	Stuart Davis
Elizabeth Dublin Marshall	Dr. Charles C. Webber	Clifford McAvoy
Gardner Jackson	Frances B. Grant	Charles Belous
Alfred Kreymborg	Hortense M. Fagley	Max Cleeber
Charles H. Houston	Alfred W. Bingham	William Gropper
Dashiel Hammett	Carl H. Levy	Arnold Donawa
Prof. Horace M. Kallen	Mary Heaton Vorse	Brand Blanshard
Ralph Roeder	Louis Welsner	Dr. Max Yergan
Evelyn Adler	Edward L. Israel	Prof. Vida D. Scudder
George Seldes	Lillian Hellman	Isabel Walker Soule
B. W. Huebsch	Louis F. McCabe	Thomas E. Benner
Hon. Vito Marcantonio	Arthur Emptage	Ephraim Cross
Bernard Denzer	C. D. Stevens	John F. Shepard
J. A. MacCallum	Bonnie Bird	Langston Hughes
James L. Brewer	Melvin Rader	Morris Watson
Hon. Dorothy Kenyon	Ralph Gundlach	Bertha C. Reynolds
Rev. Donald G. Lothrop	William H. Morris	Louis Untermeyer
Arthur La Sueur	T. Addis	Esther A. Untermeyer
Bernard J. Stern	Helen Keller	C. S. Bacon
Aaron Copland	Ada B. Taft	Howard Y. Williams
Hon. Stanley Isaacs	Jean Starr Untermeyer	Lester Cohen
Prof. Harold C. Urey	E. A. Ross	Edward Lamb
James Thurber	F. O. Matthiessen	Tom Mooney
Dr. Walter Briebl	Dr. George Barsky	Rev. William Lloyd Imes
Robert W. Dunn	Belle Zeller	L. Eloesser
Alexander Lehrman	Van Wyck Brooks	Dr. Harry Ward
Malcolm Cowley	Herman Shumlin	Prof. Walter Rauten-
Marc Blitzstein	Prof. Robert S. Lynd	strach
Walter E. Hager	Mervyn Rathborne	Hon. James H. Wolfe
Albert Maltz	Kirtley F. Mather	Eda Lou Walton
Margaret Lamont	Lawrence S. Kubie	Prof. Newton Arvin
Dr. Ernest P. Boas	James Waterman Wise	
Prof. Goodwin Watson	Irwin Shaw	

## EXHIBIT No. 2

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP, INC.,  
New York, N. Y., November 16, 1948.

DEAR FRIEND: On Monday evening, December 13, the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, and foremost leader in the democratic movement for world peace, speaks at Madison Square Garden. This eminent churchman, who will climax a month's tour of the United States with this rally, will present his impressions of the American peace movement as it relates to the peace forces of England and the continent. He will also report on his recent observations of conditions in eastern Europe and his personal conversations with the leaders of the new democracies.

We feel it is a rare privilege, indeed, for us to be able to present the Dean in the first significant rally to follow the elections. We know you will appreciate the importance of forcefully demonstrating, particularly before the new congressional session, the people's will for peace through cooperation and friendship with the Soviet Union.

The Ambassador from the Soviet Union, His Excellency Mr. Alexander S. Panyushkin, will address the meeting. The meeting will also feature Paul Robeson, other well-known speakers and a program of entertainment.

As you may recollect, thousands were turned away from the Garden on the occasion of the Dean's last visit here in 1945. Thus, to insure you proper accommodations, we are enclosing an advance ticket order blank.

Won't you plan now to attend this rally for peace and reserve seats for yourself and your friends?

Cordially yours,

RICHARD MORFORD, *Executive Director.*

RM; rs  
uopwa 16-39  
enc.

## SPONSORS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP, INC.

Louis Adamic	Dr. Harry Grundfest	Dr. Wesley C. Mitchell
George F. Addes	Dr. Alice Hamilton	Charles Michael Mitzell
Maxwell Anderson	Lillian Hellman	Pierre Monteux
John Taylor Arms	Mrs. Thomas N. Hepburn	Mme. Pierre Monteux
Max Bedacht	Dr. Leslie Pinckney Hill	Bishop Arthur W. Moulton
Mrs. Alice S. Bevester	Prof. William Ernest Hocking	Hon. James E. Murray
Dr. Henry Lambert Bibby	Dr. Walter M. Horton	Dr. Philip C. Nash
Mrs. Louis Bloch	Langston Hughes	Dr. Robert Hastings
Mrs. Anita Block	Dr. Walter Hüllihen	Nichols
Simon Braines	Hon. Stanley M. Isaacs	Eugene O'Neill
Prof. E. W. Burgess	Dr. Millard H. Jencks	Dr. Marion Edwards
Hon. Arthur Capper	Prof. Howard Mumford Jones	Park
Charles Chaplin	Helen Keller	Dr. Frederick Douglas
Hon. John M. Coffey	Rockwell Kent	Patterson
Dr. Henry S. Coffin	Dorothy Kenyon	Bishop Malcom E. Peabody
Aaron Copland	Dr. Serge Koussevitzky	Hon. Claude Pepper
Norman Corwin	Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont	Prof. Ralph Barton Perry
Jo Davidson	William W. Lancaster	Dr. E. C. Peters
Hon. Joseph E. Davies	Dr. Emil Lengel	Dr. John P. Peters
Dr. Herbert John Davis	John F. Lewis, Jr.	Henry W. Pope
Hon. Hugh DeLacy	Prof. Robert S. Lynd	Michael Quill
Dr. Stephen Duggan	Clifford T. McAvoy	Carl Randau
Prof. Albert Einstein	Judge Lois Mary McBride	Anton Refregier
Max Epstein	Maurice Maeterlinck	Elmer Rice
Dr. Mildred Fairchild	Fritz Mahler	Wallingford Riegger
Dr. Robert D. Feild	Dr. Thomas Mann	Paul Robeson
Lion Feuchtwanger	Frank X. Martel	Col. Raymond Robins
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher	Dr. Kirtley F. Mather	Earl Robinson
Homer Folks	Lewis Merrill	Reid Robinson
Dr. W. Horsley Gantt	Dr. George R. Minot	Harold J. Rome
Dr. Caleb F. Gates, Jr.	Mrs. Lucy Sprague Mitchell	Joseph A. Rosen
Dean Christian Gauss		Joseph A. Salerno
Ben Gold		
Dr. Mortimer Graves		

SPONSORS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP, INC.—CON.

Miles M. Sherover	Dr. Max Thorek	Dr. Henry N. Wieman
Raymond P. Sloan	S. A. Trone	Dr. C. C. Williams
Dr. P. A. Sorokin	Philip H. Van Gelder	Hon. James H. Wolfe
Maxwell S. Stewart	R. E. Van Horn	Dr. Max Yergan
Leopold Stokowski	Prof. George Vernadsky	Dean Mary Yost
Raymond Swing	Bishop W. J. Wells	Dr. J. J. Zmrhal
Genevieve Tabouis	Dr. Harry F. Ward	Leane Zugsmith
Hon. Elbert D. Thomas	Leroy Waterman	
R. J. Thomas	Max Weber	

EXHIBIT No. 3

This exhibit was not received by the reporter and was described by Senator McCarthy as "a cordial invitation to attend a dinner and presentation of the first annual award of the American-Russian Institute to President Franklin Roosevelt for 'Furthering American-Soviet Relations'" (transcript, p. 26).

EXHIBIT No. 4

Executive Secretary, Prof. DONALD MCCONNELL  
Secretary on Latin America, Dr. DAVID EFRON

SPONSORS

Louis Adamic	Dr. William E. Dodd	Lewis Merrill
Dr. Wallace W. Atwood	Prof. Paul M. Douglas	Dr. Clyde R. Miller
Eleanor Copenhaver	Dr. Henry Gratian Doyle	Prof Gardner Murphy
Anderson	John L. Elliott	William Pickens
Prof. Hugo Fernandez	Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild	A. Philip Randolph
Artucio	Prof. Irving Fisher	Marvyn Rathborne
Eunice Fuller Barnard	Prof. Eugene Forsey	David Saposs
Alfred M. Bingham	Margaret Forsythe	Prof. Margaret Schlauch
Algernon Black	Frances R. Grant	Adelaide Schulkind
Bruce Bliven	Alberto Grieve	Guy Emery Shipley
Dr. Franz Boas	Sidney Hillman	James T. Shotwell
Heywood Broun	Prof. Arthur N. Holcombe	Upton Sinclair
Erskine Caldwell	John Haynes Holmes	George Soule
Charlotte Carr	Quincy Howe	Isobel Walker Soule
Bennett A. Cerf	Langston Hughes	Maxwell Stewart
Evans Clark	Rev. William Lloyd Imes	Isidore F. Stone
Gifford A. Cochran	Stanley M. Isaacs	Prof. D. J. Struik
Dr. Gilberto Concepcion de	Gardiner Jackson	William Wachs
Gracia	Prof. Chester L. Jones	Prof. Goodwin Watson
Prof. George Counts	Rockwell Kent	Roy Wilkins
Malcolm Cowley	Dorothy Kenyon	Dr. Max Winkler
Prof. Horace Davis	Max Lerner	Dr. Stephen S. Wise
Prof. Jerome Davis	Marina Lopes	Max Yergan
R. E. Diffendorfer	Jean Lyons	
Bailey W. Difie	George Marshall	

CONFERENCE ON PAN AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Executive Offices: 156 Fifth Avenue, New York

Telephone: WAtkins 9-0420

DECEMBER 10-11, 1938, HOTEL WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C.

NOVEMBER 16, 1938.

DEAR FRIENDS: Enclosed you will find a Call to the Conference on Pan-American Democracy to be held in Washington on December tenth and eleventh.

On behalf of the Committee of Sponsors may I urge that your organization make every effort to participate? The problem is a pressing one and the need for some solution immediate.

We understand your organization has a very real concern with the inroads that fascism is making in this hemisphere, and we believe you can make a valu-

able contribution to our conference. If you can send representatives, please inform us at once.

We are looking forward to meeting them in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD McCONNELL.

Delegates: Bernard Stern, Harry Lamberton, William Phillips.

DM: EAL  
UOPWA.

EXHIBIT No. 5

*Trustees*

Roger Baldwin  
Joseph Brodsky  
Heywood Broun  
Edwin B. Burgum  
Malcolm Cowley  
Paul P. Crosbie  
Benjamin J. Davis, Jr.  
Robert W. Dunn  
Osmond K. Fraenkel  
Rabbi Israel Goldstein  
Alfred Hirsch  
Charles Krumbeln  
Corliss Lamont  
Leroy Peterson  
Abraham Unger  
James Waterman Wise  
Le Roy Bowman

James Gifford  
Berenice Abbott  
Peggy Bacon  
Maxwell Bodenhelm  
Kenneth Burke  
Addison T. Cutler  
Edward Dahlberg  
Clifton Fadiman  
James T. Farrell  
Waldo Frank  
Charles Fuller  
Hugo Gellert  
Mordecai Gorellk  
Granville Hicks  
Horace M. Kallen  
Dorothy Kenyon  
Carol Weiss King

*Sponsors*

Alfred Kreymborg  
Emil Lengyel  
Lewis Mumford  
Gardner Rea  
Adelaide Schulkind  
John Sloan  
Harrison Smith  
Otto Soglow  
Raphael Soyer  
Ralph Steiner  
Kathryn Terrill  
Mary Van Kleek  
Elna Lou Walton  
Harry L. Lurie

Chairman: PAUL P. CROSBIE

Secretary: JAMES LECHAY

POLITICAL PRISONERS BAIL FUND COMMITTEE

NEW YORK CITY

154 Nassau Street, Room 1200

BEckman 3-8576

JANUARY 18, 1935.

DEAR FRIEND: After reading the enclosed manifesto, we believe that you will be with us and one of us. We therefore urge you to act. Of primary importance to the large success of the Bail Fund is *your attendance* at the committee's first invited guest meeting (ticket enclosed).

This meeting will be held on Thursday, January 31st, at 8.30, in the Orozco Room of the New School for Social Research. Here the Bail Fund will be fully explained. There will be a talk by John Spivak and short talks by Roger Baldwin, Corliss Lamont and Heywood Broun. Also some words by Angelo Herndon and two other outstanding victims of the present deplorable bail situation.

Again we say, if you are with us in our purpose, do not fail to come to this meeting. Should this be impossible, however, will you avail yourself of the enclosed form in order to make closer contact with us.

Sincerely,

THE POLITICAL PRISONERS BAIL FUND COMMITTEE.

*A common bail fund for those arrested in the struggle of the working class, for the rights of oppressed minorities, in the fight against war and fascism*

EXHIBIT No. 6

AN OPEN LETTER TO GOVERNOR THOMAS E. DEWEY

[New York Times, October 9, 1944]

It has been well said, "By their deeds you shall know them."

There is a deed crying to be done in the State of New York today. A deed of simple justice, humanity, and fair play.

It is in your power and yours alone to do this act.

We ask you to grant a pardon to Morris U. Schappes.

We ask you to do this because the continued imprisonment of this teacher and scholar can only be interpreted by many thoughtful Americans as political persecution.

Morris U. Schappes has passed 11 months of an 18- to 24-month sentence arising from the 1940 Rapp-Coudert investigation of subversive activity in the New York City schools. Morris Schappes told the committee he had been a Communist. They demanded the names of all the Communists at City College. Morris Schappes named three others, who, with himself, were known as Communists. He said he knew no others. The committee said there were over 40, not 4, as Morris Schappes testified. They called Morris Schappes a perjurer. He was convicted.

This was the crime!

Even the most exacting will concede that Morris Schappes, whom even his enemies never accused of harming or even desiring to harm a single human being, has suffered enough.

We are engaged in a war against the barbarian who would impose the philosophy that an individual life is cheap. We are affirming in terrible battle that a single life is precious. We say further, Mr. Governor, that 2 years of a good man's life are precious and not to be taken away lightly.

The last years of agony have taught us that the conscience must never sleep. What is done to the least of us is the concern of all. That is why we cannot in good conscience fail to raise our voice against this injustice in our midst.

That is why we appeal to you, Mr. Governor.

To you and you alone American justice provides power above and beyond the Courts—the power of the chief executive to pardon.

We ask you to use this power to pardon Morris U. Schappes.

The deed would find favor in the eyes of the people, who love justice.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Prof. Thomas Addis, Stanford Univ.  | Rev. Dr. Kahl A. Bishars, Syrian Protestant Church of Greater N. Y.                |
| Rabbi David Aronson (Del. Am. Jewish Congress), Minneapolis, Minn.                    | Shelton Hale, Bishop, Rector, St. Philip's Episcopal Church, New York.             |
| Rabbi Aaron Ashinsky (Del. Am. Jewish Congress), Pittsburgh, Pa.                      | Rev. Dr. Clarence Bleakney, Newark, N. J.  |
| State Senator W. P. Atkinson, Seattle, Wash.  | Rabbi Maurice J. Bloom, Temple Beth Jacob, Newburn, N. Y.                          |
| Prof. Frank Baker, Pres. State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wis.                      | Prof. Bart Bok, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.                                    |
| Rev. Lee H. Ball, Lake Mahopac, N. Y.   | Rev. Lester L. Boobar, Bangor, Maine.  |
| Prof. Francis M. Barbour, S. Illinois State Teachers College, Carbondale, Ill.        | Rev. W. Russell Bowie, Instructor, Union Theological Seminary, New York.           |
| Prof. Fred A. Barnes, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N. Y.                                    | Prof. Edw. S. Boyer, Religion & Sociology, Millikin Univ., Ill.                    |
| Prof. Marlon Bauer, New York Univ.  | Millan Brand, writer.  |
| Rev. Robert Baxter, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.   | Prof. Joseph Bressler, Brooklyn College, B'klyn, N. Y.                             |
| Prof. Jos. W. Beach, Dept. of English, University of Minnesota.                       | Prof. J. P. Brets, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N. Y.                                    |
| Wm. Rose Benet, writer.   | James L. Brewer, Attorney, Rochester, N. Y.  |
| Rabbi Solomon Bersel, Philadelphia, Pa.   | Prof. Dorothy Brewster, Columbia Univ.   |
| Prof. Dorothy Bethurum, Connecticut College, New London, Conn.                        | Rev. Edward H. Brewster, Nannet, New Hampshire.                                    |
| Rev. Lyndon S. Beardsley, Westboro, Mass.   | Prof. Edgar S. Brightman, Theological School, Boston, Mass.                        |
| Rev. Archie B. Bedford, Syracuse, N. Y.   | Louis Bromfield, writer.   |
| Bishop W. Y. Bell, Halsey Institute.  | Rev. Oliver Hart Bronson, D. D., Summerland, Calif.                                |
| Dr. W. A. J. Bellrock, Pres. N. A. A. C. P., Chickasha, Oklahoma.                     | Prof. Chas. F. Brooks, Blue Hill Observatory, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. |
| Father Benedict, Church of the Crucifix, New York City.                               | Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown, Pres. Palmer Memorial Institute, Sedalia, N. C.       |
| Milly Brandt, Legislative Chairman, Women's Div.; Am. Jewish Congress.                | Van Wyck Brooks, writer.   |
| Prof. Ray O. Billington, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.                            | Rev. Robert Evans Browning, Vicar Chapel of the Redeemer, Maryland.                |
| Prof. Raymond T. Birge, Chairman, Dept. of Physics, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, Calif. |  |

- Henrietta Buckmaster, writer.  
 Edwin T. Buchrer, Editor, Journal of Liberal Religion.  
 Prof. Henry M. Burbage, Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.  
 E. A. Burdick, Dean of Students, Conn. College, New London, Conn.  
 Prof. Charles T. Barnet, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine.  
 Rev. Bates G. Burt, Rector, Pontiac, Mich.  
 Prof. John L. Buys, St. Lawrence Univ., Canton, N. Y.  
 Witter, Bynner, poet.  
 Rev. Fred L. Cairns, Needham, Mass.  
 Rev. Raymond Calkins, Minister Emeritus, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Prof. Alexander E. Cunes, Mass. State College, Amherst, Mass.  
 Prof. Nathaniel Canter, Univ. of Buffalo.  
 Rev. Francis C. Capossi, Wind Gap, Pa.  
 Edith F. Claffin, Columbia University.  
 E. N. Comfort, Dean of Oklahoma School of Religion.  
 Rev. Kieth Conning, Detroit, Mich.  
 Rabbi Jonah E. Caplan, Cong. Beth El, Long Island.  
 Rev. J. Russell Carpenter, Lyons, N. Y.  
 Rev. Ruthven S. Chalmers, Boonville, N. Y.  
 Alvin B. Christman, State Director, Penn. Farmers Union, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Rev. Merrill F. Clarks, New Canaan, Conn.  
 Rabbi Henry Cohen, Galveston, Texas.  
 Chas. H. Collins, Exec. Secy., Negro Labor Victory Com.  
 Aaron Copland, composer.  
 Prof. Fred A. Courts, Univ. of Missouri.  
 Pascal Coviei, publisher.  
 Prof. Philip W. L. Cox, N. Y. Univ.  
 Rev. Chas. E. Crak Jr., Pastor, Emmanuel Episcopal Church, Louisville, Ky.  
 Rev. Frank B. Crandall, Salem, Mass.  
 Abraham Cronbach, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
 Prof. Ephraim Cross, College of City of N. Y.  
 Margaret Cross, Director, Georgetown House, Washington, D. C.  
 Countee Cullen, poet.  
 Joseph Curran, Pres. Nat'l Maritime Union, C. I. O., N. Y. Greater Industrial Union Council.  
 W. C. Dalney, Editor, Cincinnati Union, Cin., Ohio.  
 Prof. George Dahl, Prof. of Old Testament, Yale Divinity School, New Haven.  
 Thelma M. Dale, Pres. Nat'l Negro Congress.  
 Henry W. Longfellow Dana, writer.  
 Prof. Margaret Darkow, Hunter College.
- Benjamin J. Davis Jr., Councilman, N. Y. C.  
 John W. Davis, Dean of Wesleyan Univ.  
 Rev. John Warren Day, Dean of Grace Cathedral, Topeka, Kansas.  
 Rev. John De Benedetto, Baltimore, Md.  
 Albert Dentsch, columnist.  
 Rev. Albert C. Dieffenbach, Boston, Mass.  
 Senator Chas. C. Digges, Detroit, Mich.  
 Rev. Truman Douglass, St. Louis, Mo.  
 Theodore Dreiser, writer.  
 Rev. Arthur Dumper, Dean of Trinity Cathedral (retired), Newark, N. J.  
 Roscoe Dungee, Publisher, Black Dispatch.  
 Will Durant, writer.  
 Dr. Sherwood Eddy.  
 Rev. J. Earl Edwards, Queens Village, New York.  
 Prof. Ruth Emerson, Dept. Medical Social Work, Director Social Service Dept., Univ. of Chicago.  
 O. E. Enfield, County Attorney, Ellen Co., Arnett, Okla.  
 Henry Epstein (former), Solicitor Gen'l, New York State.  
 Katherine Ets, Asst. Librarian, Nat'l City Bank, N. Y. C.  
 Jane Evans, Nat'l Fed. of Templehood Sisters, Dir. Nat'l Peace Conference.  
 Rev. John W. Findley, Univ. Presbyterian Church, Purdue University, Ind.  
 Rev. Judson E. Fiebigler, Utica, N. Y.  
 Rev. Arthur W. Farnum, St. Mary's Parish, Asheville, N. C.  
 Prof. Henry P. Fairchild, New York University.  
 Dorothy Canfield Fisher, writer.  
 Mrs. Mitchell Follansbee, League of Women Voters, Evanston, Ill.  
 Prof. Frances A. Foster, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.  
 Waldo Frank, writer.  
 Elizabeth P. Frasier, Religious Educator, Protestant Episcopal Church, Phila., Pa.  
 Rev. Stephen V. Fitchman, Boston, Mass.  
 Rev. J. Shubert Frye, Syracuse, N. Y.  
 Prof. Wendell Furry, Harvard Univ.  
 Rev. Lee Alvin Gates, Pastor, South Presbyterian Church, Buffalo, N. Y.  
 Eustace Gay, Editor, "Philadelphia Tribune."  
 Rev. Palfrey Perkins, Kings Chapel, Boston, Mass.  
 Wm. I. Gibson, Managing Editor, Afro-American Newspapers.  
 Rev. Carlyle Glams, Editor, The Presbyterian Tribune, Utica, N. Y.  
 Leonard E. Golditch, Attorney, Chairman, Nat'l Council to Combat Anti-Semitism.

- Sol Goldman (Del. to Amer. Jewish Congress), Progressive Order of the West.
- Rabbi Solomon Goldman, Zionist Org. of America, Chicago, Ill.
- Prof. Erwin B. Goodenough, Dept. History & Region, Yale University.
- Prof. Everett W. Goodhue, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
- Rabbi Robt. Gordis, Rockaway Pk., L. I.
- Julian Goodman (Del. to Am. Jewish Congress), Troy, N. Y.
- Dr. David Graubart, North Park Congregation, Shaare Tikvoh, Chicago, Ill.
- Rev. Chas. S. Gray, Stamford, Conn.
- Prof. Rowland Gray Smith, Prof. of Philosophy, Emerson College, Mass.
- Rabbi Louis Greenberg, New Haven, Conn.
- Rabbi Simon Greenberg, Phila., Pa.
- Rev. Stanley Gutellus, Rochester, N. Y.
- Rabbi Sidney S. Guthman, Chelsea, Mass.
- Rev. Herman J. Hahn, Buffalo, N. Y.
- Rabbi J. Louis Hahn, Cong. Mt. Sivan, A. E. Pres. Rabbinical Council, Upper Wash. Hts. & Inwood, N. Y.
- Prof. S. Ralph Harlow, Chairman Dept. of Religion, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
- Rabbi Harry Halpern, B'klyn, N. Y.
- Roswell, G. Han, President, Mt. Holyoke College, Mt. Holyoke, Mass.
- Wm. P. Hapgood, President, Columbia Conserve Co., Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
- Lucius C. Harper, Exec. Editor, The Chicago Defender.
- Mrs. Anton S. Harrington, Farmers Union, Schoharie Co. Com., N. Y.
- M. Lafayette Harris, Pres., Philander Smith College, Little Rock, Ark.
- Wm. Harrison, Assoc. Editor, Boston Chronicle.
- Rev. Edler G. Hawkins, N. Y. C.
- Prof. A. Gordon Hayes, Dept. of Economics, Ohio State Univ.
- Ben Hecht, writer.
- Rev. Clifford W. Hilliker, Middletown, N. Y.
- Mary E. Holland, Exec. Secy. Children's Aid, Denver, Colo.
- Dr. Eugene C. Holms, Howard Univ.
- Rev. Kenneth E. Hoover, Hobart, N. Y.
- Prof. Harold Hotelling, Columbia Univ., N. Y. C.
- Charles H. Houston, Attorney, Washington, D. C.
- Daniel Howard, Supt. of Schools, Emeritus, Windsor, Conn.
- Rev. Lee A. Howe, Jr., Oneida, N. Y.
- Rev. Duncan Howlett, New Bedford, Mass.
- Langston Hughes, writer, poet.
- Mattie Hunter, Nat'l Council of Negro Women.
- Joseph Hyman, Jewish Federation, Indianapolis, Ind.
- Hulan E. Jack, New York State Assemblyman.
- Sam Jaffee, actor.
- David D. Jones, Pres. Binnell College, Greensboro, N. C.
- Matthew Josephson, writer.
- Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan, Society for the Advancement of Judaism.
- Prof. Raymond Kennedy, Dept. of Sociology, Yale University.
- Rockwell, Kent, artist.
- Judge Dorothy Kenyon, New York.
- Freda Kirchway, Editor, "The Nation".
- Rev. Stephen L. Kiser, Richmond Hill, N. Y.
- Harold V. Knight, Editor, North Dakota Union Farmer.
- Rev. Carl Knudson, Plymouth, Mass.
- Rev. C. Franklin Koch, New York City.
- Prof. Michael Kraus, College of City of N. Y.
- Rev. Alfred M. Lambert, St. Monica's Church, Hartford, Conn.
- Rev. John Howland Lathrop, Church of Our Savior, New York City.
- Prof. Walter Landauer, Univ. of Conn.
- Paula Laurence, actress.
- John Howard Lawson, screen writer, Hollywood.
- Canada Lee, actor.
- Prof. Paul Lehman, Biblical History, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
- Ray Lev, pianist.
- Prof. Norman Levinson, Mass. Inst. of Technology.
- Rabbi Israel Herbert Levinthal, D. D.; D. H. L., B'klyn Jewish Center.
- Rabbi Benj. A. Lichter, Cong. B'nai Israel, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- Louis Lipsky, Amer. Jewish Conference & Del. to Amer. Jewish Congress.
- Rabbi Emmanuel Lederman, Denver, Colorado.
- Frank Marshall Louis, Assoc. Negro Press.
- Rev. Moses B. Lovell, B'klyn, N. Y.
- Rev. Sidney Lovell, Chaplain, Yale Univ.
- Harry L. Lurie, Former Dir. Council Jewish Fed. & Welfare Funds, New York City.
- Florence H. Lascomb, Civil Liberties Union, Cambridge, Mass.
- Rev. Dr. John A. McCallum, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Lucasville, Ohio.
- James H. McGill, McGill Mfg. Co., Valparaiso, Ind.
- Rev. Chas. F. MacLennan, Cleveland, Ohio.
- John T. McManus, Movie Critic, New York City.
- Rev. Walter Henry MacPherson, S. T. A., Past Pres. of the Universalist Church of America.
- Prof. W. H. Mainwaring, Emeritus, Stanford Univ., Calif.

- Rabbi Jerome Malho, Danbury, Conn.  
 Albert Maltz, writer, Hollywood.  
 Rep. Vito Marcantonio, Congressman, N. Y. C.  
 George Marshall, Nat'l. Fed. of Constitutional Liberties, N. Y. C.  
 George Matis, Farmers Union, St. Johnsville, N. Y.  
 Prof. F. O. Matthieson, Harvard Univ.  
 Rev. Wm. H. Melish, Church of the Holy Trinity, N. Y. C.  
 Rev. Harry C. Mesine, Buffalo, N. Y.  
 Rabbi Israel Miller, Bronx, N. Y.  
 Erin O'Brien-Moore, actress.  
 Julian Morgenstern, President, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
 Prof. Margaret S. Morris, Pembroke College in Brown Univ., Providence, R. I.  
 Prof. H. Nethercot, Northwestern Univ.  
 Prof. Robt. H. Nichols, Union Theological Seminary.  
 Rev. Chas. C. Noble, Syracuse, N. Y.  
 Mrs. Josephine Nordstrand, Exec. Secy. Wisconsin State Conf. on Soc. Leg. Senator Stanley Nowak, Michigan, 21st District.  
 Rev. Delos O'Brien, Wilmington, Delaware.  
 Judge Patric H. O'Brien, Detroit, Mich.  
 Sono Osato, dancer.  
 H. A. Overstreet, Prof. Emeritus, C. C. N. Y.  
 Ruth H. Page, Stowe College Alumni, St. Louis, Mo.  
 Rev. George L. Paine, Cambridge, Mass.  
 State Rep. Wm. J. Pennock, Pres. Washington Pension Union, Seattle, Wash.  
 Angeline E. Phillips, Recording Secy. Community Church, Berks Co., Pa.  
 Harriet Ida Pickens, Nat'l. Bus. & Prof. Council, Y. W. C. A., N. Y. C.  
 Martin Popper, Nat'l. Lawyers Guild, N. Y. C.  
 Elizabeth L. Porter, Case Supervisor, Family Service Soc., New Orleans, La.  
 Prof. Kenneth W. Porter, Vassar College.  
 Rev. Edwin McNeill Poter, Rochester, N. Y.  
 Dr. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., Editor "Peoples Voice," Congressional Nominee.  
 Rev. Irving E. Putnam, Association of Wesley Methodist Churches, Minneapolis, Minn.  
 Michael J. Quill, N. Y. C. Councilman, Pres. Transport Workers Union.  
 Senator Thomas C. Robbins, 35th District, Seattle, Wash.  
 Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch, Columbia University.  
 Rev. Daniel Lyman Didont, Phila., Pa.  
 Mary W. Rittenhouse, B'klyn Bureau of Charities, N. Y. C.  
 Paul Robeson, actor, singer.  
 Dr. Henry B. Robins, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.  
 Earl Robinson, composer, Hollywood.  
 Sol S. Rodin, Secy., Brith Achim Assoc., Edwin A. Rurit, Sage School of Philosophy, Cornell Univ., Ithica, N. Y.  
 Prof. George Sarton, Harvard Univ.  
 Col. Wm. Jay Schieffeln.  
 Prof. Margaret Schlauch, N. Y. U.  
 Helen S. Sellers, Member of Conn. House of Rep. (1941-42).  
 Rabbi Max Shapiro, Mtama, Fla.  
 Rev. Arthur Shenefelt, Norwood, Ohio.  
 Prof. John F. Shepard, Pres. Civil Rights Fed., Detroit, Mich.  
 Dr. Guy Emery Shipler, Editor, The Churchman.  
 Prof. George H. Shull, Princeton, Univ., Princeton, N. J.  
 Eva Smill, Exec. Secy., Family Service Soc., New Orleans, La.  
 Mason Smith, Editor, "The Interracial Review".  
 Rev. F. Hastings Smyth, Superior, The Society of the Catholic Commonwealth, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Mrs. Samuel Spiegel, Nat'l Women's League of United Synagogues.  
 Prof. Bertha K. Stavrianos, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.  
 J. Stanley Stevens, Chaplain, U. S. N. R.  
 Donald Ogden Stewart, writer, Hollywood.  
 Prof. Dirk J. Struik, Mass. Inst. of Technology.  
 Rev. Harold C. Swezy, Church of Holy Apostle, N. Y. C.  
 Prof. Jessie M. Tatlock, Mt. Holyoke, College.  
 Prof. Alva Taylor, Secy., Southern Conf. for Human Welfare, Nashville, Tenn.  
 Janet Thornton, Director, Social Service, Presbyterian Hospital, N. Y. C.  
 Rev. Joseph H. Titus, Jamaica, N. Y.  
 Rep. Nicholas Tomassetti, Rep. from New Britain to Conn. General Assembly.  
 Judge Edward V. Toffen.  
 Rabbia Joshua Trachtenberg.  
 Jim Tully, writer.  
 Mark Van Doren, writer.  
 John Van Druten, playwright.  
 Pierre Van Paassen, writer, journalist.  
 Oswald Garrison Villard, writer.  
 Prof. Eda Lou Walton, N. Y. University.  
 Rabbi Juda Washer, New Kensington, Pa.  
 Prof. Harry F. Ward, Union Theological Seminary.  
 M. Moran Weston, Chairman, N. Y. State Civil Liberties, Dept. N. Y. State Elks Assoc.  
 Prof. F. W. Weymouth, Stanford Univ.  
 Prof. Phillip E. Wheelwright, Dartmouth College.



Prof. George F. Whlcher, Amherst College.  
 Rev. John C. White, Bishop of Springfield, Illinois.  
 Doxy Wilkerson, Exec. Editor "Peoples Voice".  
 Robt. Wilkerson, Exec. Secy., Negro Welfare Assn., Anderson, Ind.  
 Rev. C. Lawson Willard Jr., Trinity Episcopal Church, New Haven, Conn.  
 Rev. David Rhys Williams, Rochester, N. Y.  
 Rabbi Samuel Wohl, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Dr. Abraham Wolfson, Pres., Jewish Social Service Bureau, Newark, N. J.  
 Prof. Theresa Wolfson, B'klyn College.  
 Prof. Thomas Woody, Prof. of Education, Univ. of Pa., Phila., Pa.  
 Mary E. Woolley, President Emerita, Mt. Holyoke College.  
 Prof. Henry N. Wrieman, Prof. of Philosophy of Religion, Univ. of Chicago.  
 Prof. Paul Thomas Young, Univ. of Illinois.  
 Rabbi S. M. Zampowsky, Cleveland, Ohio.  
 Wm. Zorach, sculptor.

Organizations listed for identification purposes. 500 names unlisted for reasons of space.

---

EXHIBIT No. 7

[Daily Worker, February 10, 1938]

LEADING CITIZENS LAUD ISAACS' STAND ON GERSON

Condemning the "witch-hunting campaign" organized against Borough President Stanley M. Isaacs for his appointment of S. W. Gerson, former Daily Worker reporter as an assistant on his staff, 47 prominent citizens last night signed a letter to the Borough President supporting him in his determination to appoint competent persons to office.

The letter, released for publication by Tom Cassidy, vice president of the American Newspaper Guild and Daily News staff writer, carries the names of outstanding liberals, trade-unionists, educators, and clergymen.

The text of the letter and names of the signers follow:

Dear Mr. Isaacs:

We, the undersigned, citizens of different shades of opinion, emphatically condemn the witch-hunting campaign organized against you for the appointment of Simon W. Gerson to your staff.

We look upon the current inspired agitation against you—which bears the earmarks of some of the propaganda so discredited and overwhelmingly repudiated in the last election—as a threat to the whole merit system in public service. It is the first step which leads to the institution of political qualifications within the entire city service. If the present agitation is successful, the next logical step is the institution of a system of political discrimination within the Civil Service system. How far is that from the malodorous method of choosing public servants from political clubhouse backrooms?

We urge you to stand firm against this attempt to attack appointments on the merit basis. We support you—as do thousands of liberal though inarticulate citizens—in your determination to maintain your right to appoint competent persons to office, irrespective of political outlook, a right won by the citizens of New York only after years of struggle against corrupt political influence.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel Allen, Regional Director, State, County, and Municipal Employees Assn.; Recorder John K. Ackley, City College of New York; Dr. Helen Adams, Hunter College; William Albertson, Secretary, Local 16, Waiters and Waitresses Union; Prof. Edwin B. Burgum, Washington Square College, N. Y. U.; Prof. Theodore Brameld, Adelphi College; Samuel Berland, Mgr., Laundry Workers Union; Michael J. Quill, City Councilman; Dr. Harry F. Ward, Union Theological Seminary; Rev. Bradford Young; Rev. William B. Spofford; Rev. Lawson Willard, Jr., Past County Chaplain, American Legion, Queens County; Rev. A. Clayton Powell, Jr.; Miss Helen Murray, Associate Secretary, Methodist Federation of Social Service; Samuel A. Robbins, Chairman, Council of U. S. Veterans and American Legionnaire; Dorothy Kenyon, Consumers Union; Vito Marcantonio, former Congressman; Tom Cassidy, Vice-President Newspaper Guild; Carl Randau, President, Newspaper Guild; Austin Hogan, President, N. Y. Local Transport Workers Union; Alexander Hoffman, Manager, Cleaners and Dyers Union; George Wishmack, Coordinator, International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Ashley Patten, Executive Secretary, Pullman Porters; Louis Weinstock, Secretary-Treasurer, District Council 9, Painters and Decorators; David Freed, Secretary, Local 802, American Federation of Musicians; Eugene P. Connolly, Organizer, Transport Workers Union; Jonathan Eddy, Executive Vice-President Newspaper Guild; Victor Pásche, Secretary-Treasurer, Newspaper Guild; Mervyn Rathborne, President, American Communications Association; Harry Gewirtzman, Manager, Pocket-Book Workers Union; Samuel Kramberg, Local 302, Hotel and Restaurant Workers Alliance; Irving Potash, Manager, Joint Council Furriers Union; Ben Golden, Labor Arbitrator; Vera Montgomery, Editor and Publisher, Yorkville Advance; Prof. John L. Childs, Teachers College; Prof. Robert K. Speer, Washington Square College; Dr. John McAlpin Miller, Long Island University; Dr. John T. Thirwall, City College of New York; Prof. Margaret Schlauch, New York University; Prof. Lyman R. Bradley, New York University; Prof. Beryl Parker, New York University; Prof. V. J. McGill, Hunter College; Prof. Howard Selam, Brooklyn College; Malcolm Cowley, Editor, New Republic; Eda Lou Walton, poet and critic; Dr. Charles A. Hendley, President, Teachers Union; Julia Church Kolar, Executive Board Member, Descendants of the American Revolution.

---

EXHIBIT No. 8

LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS,

NEW YORK

(Photostat not legible—retained in subcommittee files.)

EXHIBIT No. 9

Chairman: WILLIAM E. DODD, JR.

Treasurer: S. D. DOUGLAS

Executive Secretary: LEONARD S. BELLER

Advisers on Anti-Nazi Literature: PRINCE HUBERTUS ZU LOEWENSTEIN

(German Catholic Leader)

DR. KURT ROSENFELD (Former Minister of Justice in Prussia)

Sponsors

Carleton Beals	Dr. John Lovejoy Elliott	Judge S. D. Levy
T. A. Bisson	Dr. H. C. Engelbrecht	Prof. Eduard C. Landsman
Harriet Stanton Blatch	Martha Graham	Prof. R. M. MacIver
Anita Block	Prof. Albert Guerdard	Annie Nathan Meyer
S. John Block	Prof. Alice Hamilton	Lewis Mumford
Prof. Franz Boss	Moss Hart	Dr. Henry Neumann
Dr. Barrett H. Clark	I. A. Hirschmann	Prof. Fredrick L. Schuman
Prof. Thomas C. Cochran	Rockwell Kent	R—— S——
Malcolm Cowley	Dorothy Kenyon	Dr. —— Philip Silver
Kate Crane-Gartz	Prof. Wm. H. Kilpatrick	——— Van Doren
Dr. Walter Damrosch	Freda Kirchwey	Lillian D. Wald
Prof. John Dewey	Justice Anna M. Kross	

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR ANTI-NAZI LITERATURE

Suite 302—20 Vesey Street

NEW YORK CITY

REctor 2-5867

Cable Address: LITCOM

MARCH 24, 1939.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,

New York City

GENTLEMEN: May we have your opinion on the enclosed bill. We would appreciate a prompt reply.

Thanking you for your cooperation, we are

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD S. BELLER, Executive Secretary.

LB: EL.

EXHIBIT No. 10

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRACY AND INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM,

New York City, January 17, 1940.

HON. MARTIN DIES,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: On the basis of a careful analysis of the proceedings and releases of the Dies Committee, copy of which I am enclosing, the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom has come to the conclusion that the further existence of the Dies Committee would constitute a serious threat to intellectual freedom and civil rights in the United States. In our analysis we present thorough documentation to substantiate this contention.

We have also submitted to the Speaker of the House petitions urging the discontinuance of the Dies Committee, signed by 5,672 American citizens, largely from the academic and related fields. Further signatures will be transmitted this week. Among the signers of this petition are twelve college presidents, six college deans, and many other leaders of American culture and professional life. I am enclosing a copy of the petition blank and a list of the outstanding signatories for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

FRANZ BOSS, National Chairman.

AMONG THE SIGNATORIES TO THE PETITION SPONSORED BY AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRACY AND INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM TO DISCONTINUE THE DIES COMMITTEE

Frank E. Baker, President, Milwaukee State Teachers College

Rufus E. Clement, President, Atlanta University

Clarence M. Dykstra, President, University of Wisconsin

AMONG THE SIGNATORIES TO THE PETITION SPONSORED BY AMERICAN COMMITTEE  
FOR DEMOCRACY AND INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM TO DISCONTINUE THE DIES  
COMMITTEE—Continued

William Alfred Eddy, President, Hobart and William Smith Colleges  
 Guy Stanton Ford, President, University of Minnesota  
 George Willard Frasier, President, Colorado State College of Education  
 Ralph K. Hickok, President, Western College  
 Raymond A. Kent, President, University of Louisville  
 Frank Kingdon, President, University of Newark  
 William A. Nelson, Former President, Smith College  
 Walter Dill Scott, Former President, Northwestern University  
 Mary E. Woolley, Former President, Mt. Holyoke College  
 Harold C. Urey, Nobel laureate in chemistry, Columbia  
 John Dewey, Professor emeritus of Philosophy  
 Charles A. Beard, Former President, American Historical Association  
 J. McKeen Cattell, Editor, "Science"  
 Francis J. McConnell, Bishop, Methodist Church  
 Paul U. Kellogg, Editor, "Survey Graphic"  
 Olin Downes, Music Critic, "The New York Times"  
 Jonathan Daniels, Editor, "Raleigh News & Observer"  
 Paul Robeson, Singer and actor  
 Zachariah Chafee, Jr., Professor, Harvard University  
 Paul J. Kern, President, Municipal Civil Service Commission of N. Y. C.  
 Charlotte Carr, Head, Hull House, Chicago  
 Edith Abbott, Dean, University of Chicago School of Social Service  
 Ned H. Dearborn, Dean, New York University  
 Christian Gauss, Dean, Princeton University  
 Malcolm S. McLean, Dean, University of Minnesota  
 Frank L. Mott, Dean, University of Iowa  
 Carl Wittke, Dean, Oberlin College  
 Mary Antin, Author  
 Joseph Warren Peach, Author  
 Van Wyck Brooks, Author  
 Lillian Hellman, Author  
 Inez Haynes Irwin, Author  
 Emil Lengyel, Author  
 Elmer Rice, Author  
 Ralph Roeder, Author  
 William Carlos Williams, Author  
 Henry Pratt Fairchild, Professor, New York University  
 Randolph B. Smith, Director, Cooperative School for Teachers  
 Sophronisba P. Breckenridge, Former President, American Association of Schools  
 of Social Work  
 Comfort A. Adams, Former President, American Institute of Electrical Engineers  
 Oswald Veblen, Former President, American Mathematical Society  
 John P. Peters, Secretary, Committee of Physicians for Improvement of Medical  
 Care  
 A. M. Schlesinger, Vice-President, American Historical Association  
 W. H. Mallisoff, Editor, "Philosophy of Science"  
 Ellsworth Huntington, Professor, Yale University  
 Edward C. Tolman, Professor, University of California  
 George P. Adams, Professor, University of California  
 Ralph Linton, Editor, "The American Anthropologist"  
 W. A. Oldfather, Former President, American Philological Association  
 Walter R. Hager, Secretary, Teachers College, Columbia University  
 John F. Fulton, Yale Medical School  
 Ralph Barton Perry, Author, Pulitzer Prize biography of William James  
 Clyde Eagleton, Professor, New York University  
 Karl Menninger, Director, Psychiatric Clinic, Topeka, Kansas  
 Robert S. Lynd, Professor, Columbia University  
 Fred L. Redefers, Secretary, Progressive Education Association  
 Halford E. Luccock, Professor, Yale Divinity School  
 Alice Hamilton, Professor emeritus, Harvard Medical School  
 Vida D. Scudder, Professor, Wellesley College  
 Eugene W. Lyman, Professor, Union Theological Seminary  
 D. W. Prall, Professor, Harvard University

AMONG THE SIGNATORIES TO THE PETITION SPONSORED BY AMERICAN COMMITTEE  
FOR DEMOCRACY AND INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM TO DISCONTINUE THE DIES  
COMMITTEE—Continued

A. J. Carlson, Former President, American Physiological Society  
 Paul F. Gemmill, Professor, University of Pennsylvania  
 Edgar Dale, Professor, Ohio State University  
 Lester Dix, Principal, Lincoln School  
 V. T. Thayer, Educational Director, Ethical Culture Schools  
 Harry J. Carman, Professor, Columbia University.  
 Gortwin Watson, Professor, Columbia University.  
 L. G. Barth, Professor, Columbia University.  
 Dorothy Douglas, Professor, Smith College.  
 Frank H. Hankins, Professor, Smith College.  
 Hadley Contri, Professor, Princeton University.  
 Roy Dickinson Welch, Professor, Princeton University.  
 Hirtley F. Mather, Director, Harvard University, Summer School.  
 Morris R. Cohen, Professor, College of the City of New York.  
 Harry A. Overstreet, Professor, College of the City of New York.  
 Jerome Davis, Former President, American Federation of Teachers.  
 Robert Iglehart, Vice President, American Federation of Teachers.  
 Alonzo F. Myers, President, New York College Teachers Union.  
 Max Lerner, Professor, Williams College.  
 Jesse H. Holmes, Professor, Swarthmore College.  
 George Soule, Editor, "The New Republic".  
 Malcolm Cowley, Editor, "The New Republic".  
 Freda Kirchwey, Editor, "The Nation".  
 Maxwell S. Stewart, Editor, "The Nation".  
 Victor Weybright, Editor, "Survey Graphic".  
 Frank C. Bancroft, Editor, "Social Work Today".  
 Dashiell Hammett, Author.  
 Leone Zugsmith, Author.  
 Arthur Koher, Author.  
 Countee Cullen, Poet.  
 Matthew Josephson, Author.  
 Joan Starr Untermeyer, Poet.  
 Alfred Kreymborg, Author.  
 Donald Ogden Stewart, President, League of American Writers.  
 Lewis Mumford, Author.  
 Herman Shumlin, Producer.  
 W. W. Norton, Publisher.  
 Villjalmur Stefansson, Past President, Explorers Club.  
 Mario Romaet-Rosenoff, Musician.  
 Aaron Copland, Composer.  
 Lehman Engel, Musician.  
 Rockwell Kent, Artist.  
 Morris Carnovsky, Actor.  
 Oliver D. Fargo, Author  
 Phillip Loch, Actor  
 Max Yergan, Secretary, International Institute for African Affairs  
 Charles Bolous, Former Councilman, New York City  
 Dorothy Kenyon, Former Justice, New York City  
 Hugh DeLacy, Councilman, Seattle  
 Justino Miso Polier, Justice, New York City  
 Nicholas Tomassetti, Representative, Connecticut  
 William Lloyd Imes, Reverend, New York City  
 John Howard Lathrop, Reverend, Brooklyn, New York  
 Mary Van Kloock, Russell Sage Foundation  
 Mrs. Rachel Davis-Dubois, Service Bureau for Intercultural Education  
 Dr. Bernard Glucek, Psychiatrist  
 John B. Andrews, Secretary, American Association for Labor Legislation  
 J. F. Dashiell, Professor, University of North Carolina  
 Edward A. Ross, Professor emeritus, University of Wisconsin  
 W. H. Manwaring, Professor emeritus, Columbia University  
 Willystine Goodsell, Professor emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University  
 Mitchell Franklin, Professor, Tulane University

AMONG THE SIGNATORIES TO THE PETITION SPONSORED BY AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRACY AND INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM TO DISCONTINUE THE DIES COMMITTEE—Continued

Harry Elmer Barnes, Historian and Journalist  
 Edwin G. Boring, Professor, Harvard University  
 Rev. Alfred W. Swan, Madison, Wisconsin  
 Sera Bard Field, Poet  
 Charles Erskine Scott Wood, Writer  
 S. Stephenson Smith, Professor, University of Oregon  
 James B. Carey, Secretary, C. I. O.  
 Charles William Taussig, Chairman, National Advisory Committee  
 Martha Dodd, Writer  
 William E. Dodd, Former Ambassador to Germany  
 George Seldes, Author  
 C. E. Ficken, Dean, Macalester College

EXHIBIT No. 11

JAMES WATERMAN WISE, *Chairman*      ISOBEL WALKER SOULE, *Executive Secretary*  
 SARAH JACKSON SMITH, *Secretary-Treasurer*

<p>ADVISORY COMMITTEE</p> <p>Stella Adler              Helen Alfred              Leroy Bowman              Rebecca Grecht              J. B. S. Hardman              Mary W. Hillyer              Lawrence Hosie              Grace Hutchins</p>	<p>John Paul Jones              Dorothy Kenyon              Freda Kirchwey              Harry W. Laidler              Margaret L. Lamont              Grace Lumpkin              Vito Marcantonio              Reinhold Niebuhr              Clifford Odets</p>	<p>Evelyn Preston              Margaret Schlauch              Sarah Jackson Smith              Isobel Walker Soule              Robert Speer              Eda Lou Walton              Bertha Pool Weyl              James Waterman Wise              Theresa Wolfson</p>
--	---	--

CITIZENS COMMITTEE TO AID STRIKING SEAMEN

227 West 22nd Street

NEW YORK CITY

CHelsea 2-9786

JANUARY 28, 1937.

DEAR FRIEND: The East Coast Seamen have called off the strike. They have won some concessions. This decision will help the West Coast Seamen bring their strike to a more successful end. This action has been commended by the N. L. R. B. Hearings are being continued by them.

Now, the seamen are trying to get their jobs back. Many are already on the high seas, while others here are carrying on the fight against discrimination, lockout, blacklist and the Copeland Bill. These men are still without shelter, food and clothing. In addition to the East Coast men, about 1,000 Pacific Coast strikers who struck when their vessels reached Eastern shores, are without resources.

These men are entirely dependent on our Soup Kitchen at 338 W. 25th St. for food. Debts for gas, electricity, and other essentials threaten its existence.

You have shown your warm-hearted interest in the men by your contributions during the strike. We appeal to you now—to help these men who conducted an heroic, epoch-making battle for 84 long, cold winter days. Many of these men are ill due to exposure and undernourishment.

All we ask you to do is send a small contribution of, say, one, two or five dollars, to tide over a difficult back-to-work period.

Won't you give your answer today? Please do take out your pen and write your check as soon as you read this letter.

Very sincerely yours,

Secretary, Citizens' Committee to Aid Striking Seamen.

## EXHIBIT No. 12

## Executive Committee:

Dr. Worthy M. Tippy,  
Honorary President  
Prof. Henry Pratt Fair-  
child, President  
Gardner Jackson, Vice  
President  
Robert K. Speer, Treas-  
urer  
Samuel J. Rodman, Sec-  
retary  
Edward K. Kern, Direc-  
tor of Activities  
Algernon Black  
Hadley Cantril  
Ned H. Dearborn  
Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein  
Helen Hall  
Rita Hochheimer  
A. J. Isserman  
Spurgeon Keeny  
Clyde Miller  
Dudley Nichols  
Louise Pearson  
Etta Schneider  
Mark Starr  
Katherine Terrill  
Mrs. Joseph L. White

## Advisory Board:

Sherwood Anderson  
James W. Angell  
Louis Adamic  
Thurman Arnold  
Vicki Baum  
William R. Benet  
Franz Boas  
Louis Bromfield  
James L. Brewer  
Dr. A. A. Brill  
Heywood Brown  
Senator Arthur Capper  
Marc Connelly  
Humphrey Cobb  
Olin Downes  
William E. Dodd  
Theodore Dreiser  
Walter Prichard Eaton  
Dorothy Canfield Fisher  
Abraham Flexner  
Osmond K. Fraenkel  
Edwin Franko Goldman  
Rev. Ernest G. Guthrie  
Dashiell Hammett  
Lillian Hellman  
Jesse H. Holmes  
Mrs. Sheppard Homans  
William K. Howard  
Mrs. Harold L. Ickes  
Rex Ingram  
Stanley M. Isaacs  
Horace M. Kallen  
Dorothy Kenyon  
Paul J. Kern  
Freda Kirchwey  
Fritz Lang  
Robert D. Leigh  
Irene Lewisoan  
Robert Morss Lovett  
Thomas Mann  
Fredric March  
Phillip Merivale  
Dudley Murphy  
W. W. Norton  
Lee Pressman  
Will Rogers, Jr.  
Alex Rose  
John Rothschld  
Wm. J. Schieffelin  
Viola Brothers Shore  
Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver  
Rexford G. Tugwell  
Lillian D. Wald  
Walter White  
Mary E. Woolley

## FILM AUDIENCES FOR DEMOCRACY

342 Madison Ave.

NEW YORK CITY

Phone VAnDerbilt 6-3660

OCTOBER 20, 1939.

Mr. VICTOR RIESEL,

*Managing Editor, The New Leader Publishing Association.**New York City.*

DEAR MR. RIESEL: Mr. Kern requests me to say that he is speaking more or less extemporaneously from a handful of notes at the Rand School, Monday.

If you wish to have your stenographer cover that it is agreeable to Mr. Kern.

Yours truly,

FLEET MUNSON.

To ENCOURAGE films that uphold American democracy, civil liberties, and peace; that promote better understanding and improve neighborly relations between racial and religious groups; that present an accurate, undistorted as well as a socially useful portrayal of the contemporary scene. To OPPOSE all totalitarian trends, attacks on labor, and films contrary to the principles of the Bill of Rights

## EXHIBIT No. 13

Vol. 1, No. 2

April, 1939

## FILMS FOR DEMOCRACY

NEW YORK CITY

A nonprofit membership organization dedicated to encouraging the production and distribution of truthful, fearless films which safeguard and strengthen American Democracy.

## President:

Dr. Henry Pratt Fair-  
child

## Vice President:

Gardner Jackson

## Treasurer:

Dr. Robert K. Speer

## Secretary:

Samuel J. Rodman

## Executive committee:

Hadley Cantril  
Ned H. Dearborn  
Helen Hall

A. J. Isserman

Clyde Miller

Dudley Nichols

Louise Pearson

Mark Starr

Mrs. Joseph L. White

## Advisory Board:

Sherwood Anderson.

James W. Angell

Louis Adamic

Thurman Arnold

Vicki Baum

William B. Benet

Franz Boas

Louis Bromfield

1500 STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

Advisory board—Con.	Advisory board—Con.	Advisory board—Con.
James L. Brewer	Rev. Ernest G. Guthrie	Frederic March
A. A. Brill	Dashiell Hammett	Thomas Mann
Heywood Brown	Lillian Hellman	Philip Merivale
Senator Arthur Capper	Jesse H. Holmes	Dudley Murphy
Marc Connelly	Mrs. Sheppard Homans	W. W. Norton
Humphrey Cobb	William K. Howard	Lee Pressman
Olin Downes	Mrs. Harold L. Ickes	John Rothschild
William E. Dodd	Rex Ingram	Will Rogers, Jr.
Theodore Dreiser	Stanley M. Isaacs	Wm. J. Scheffelin
Theodore Dreiser	Horace M. Kallen	Viola Brothers Shore
Walter Prichard Eaton	Dorothy Kenyon	Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver
Dorothy Canfield Fisher	Freda Kirchwey	Rexford G. Tugwell
Abraham Flexner	Fritz Lang	Lillian D. Wald
Osmond K. Fraenkel	Robert D. Leigh	Walter F. Wagner
Edwin Franko Goldman	Irene Lewisohn	Walter White
	Robert Morss Lovett	Mary E. Woolley

EXHIBIT No. 14

PROGRAM OF THE GREATER NEW YORK EMERGENCY CONFERENCE  
ON INALIENABLE RIGHTS

Monday, February 12, 1940, at Two West Sixty-fourth Street, New York City,  
the Meeting House of the Society for Ethical Culture

Organized antidemocratic forces are threatening the security and freedom of human personality and the rights of minority groups here in the United States. They are dividing, confusing, and weakening those who wish to maintain our free democratic institutions. Such forces of oppression and fear, growing stronger because of the war in Europe, must not be permitted to overwhelm us. Never before have our constitutional liberties been under such concerted attack. At this moment we have a special responsibility as a united people to meet our danger and protect our rights. There are literally thousands of nonpolitical organizations in the City of New York which are vitally concerned with the maintenance of the Bill of Rights, with minority and neighborhood relations, and with antidemocratic legislation. This Conference is for them.

ROBERT W. SEALE, *Chairman.*

9:30 a. m.—Registration of delegates and visitors  
11 a. m.—General session

*Presiding Chairman:* DR. MAX YERGAN, Director, International  
Committee on African Affairs

12:30 to 2 p. m.—Luncheon interval  
2-5 p. m.—Panel discussions—Announcement of panel chairmen and speakers  
on page 2  
5-8 p. m.—Dinner interval  
8 p. m.—General session—*Presiding Chairman:* DR. FRANK KINGDON, President,  
University of Newark  
Reports of panel discussions  
Selection of Continuations Committee

Speakers:

DR. JOHN ELLIOTT, Senior Leader, Society of Ethical Culture  
CONGRESSMAN JOHN M. COFFEE  
DR. MARY E. WOOLLEY, President Emeritus of Mt. Holyoke College  
PROFESSOR K. N. LEWELLYN, Columbia Law School  
ROGER N. BALDWIN, Director, American Civil Liberties Union  
SAMUEL L. M. BARLOW, National Emergency Conference for Democratic  
Rights  
OTHER SPEAKERS TO BE ANNOUNCED



GREATER NEW YORK EMERGENCY CONFERENCE ON INALIENABLE RIGHTS  
Room 508, 2 West 43rd Street, New York City

PANELS

PANEL I—"FOREIGN BORN"

1. How to focus our energies the better to preserve the rights of the foreign born.
2. How the foreign-language and foreign-born groups can unite to preserve and enlarge democracy for themselves and for all Americans.
3. How to bring before the foreign born their duties and privileges as Americans.
4. How to disseminate and coordinate the best in both foreign and American cultures that both may gain in understanding.

*Chairman of Panel:* Dr. Frank Klingdon, President, University of Newark.

*Panel Speakers:* Dr. Gerald F. Machacek, President, United Czechoslovak American Societies.

Erwin H. Klaus, Editor, The German-American.

Younghill Kang, New York University.

Edward Corsi, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Welfare.

Vilhjalmur Stefansson.

Irving Novick, Acting Secretary, American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born.

M. Garriga, Int'l Vice President, Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union.

Nathaniel Phillips, President, National League for American Citizenship.

Dr. Emil Lengyel.

PANEL II—"THE CHURCH AND THE CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRACY"

1. What Democracy means to Religion.
2. What Religion means to Democracy.
3. What are the official attitudes of the Religious Bodies toward all phases of Discrimination.
4. What is involved in freedom of speech for the clergy.
5. What is the Responsibility of the Church in the face of attacks upon Minorities.
6. What practical methods are available to the Church.

*Chairman of Panel:* Rev. Lorenzo H. King, St. Mark's Methodist Church.

*Panel Speakers:* Dr. Emanuel Chapman, Fordham University.

Rev. A. J. Muste, American Labor Temple.

Rabbi William F. Rosenblum, Exec. Committee member, New York Board of Jewish Ministers.

Rev. John Paul Jones, Union Church of Bay Ridge.

Dr. Theodore F. Savage, President, the Greater New York Federation of Churches.

Rabbi David DeSola Pool, Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue.

PANEL III—"LABOR AND DEMOCRACY"

1. Labor's Civil Rights.
2. Congressional Investigating Committees
  - a. Dies Committee—its methods, procedure and objectives.
  - b. The Smith Committee—its methods, procedure and objectives.
  - c. The LaFollette Committee—comparison of procedure with that of other Congressional investigating committees.
3. Legislation and the Trade Union Movement
  - a. Analysis of the Allen Bills.
  - b. Criminal Syndicalism Laws.
  - c. The application of the Sherman Anti-trust Act.
  - d. The Wages and Hours Law.

*Chairman of Panel:* Leo Huberman.

*Panel Speakers:* Merle Vincent, General Solicitor, Wages and Hours Administration.

Elmer Brown, President, Typographical Union, Local No. 6, A. F. of L.  
Nathan Green.

Gardner Jackson, Labor's Non-Partisan League.

Manning Johnson, Business Agent, Cafeteria Employees' Union, A. F. of L.  
Other speakers to be announced.

PANEL IV—"ORGANIZING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION"

1. Actual experiences of violations of civil liberties in neighborhoods.
2. Pending Legislation against Civil Liberties.
3. What the Neighborhoods are accomplishing. Legislative conferences; citizens' rights groups; neighborhood papers; the financing of neighborhood groups.
4. Practical steps to be taken to further organization in the neighborhoods.

*Chairman of Panel:* Dean Ned H. Dearborn, New York University.

*Panel Speakers:* Hon. Stanley M. Isaacs.

Hon. Vito Marcantonio.

Dr. Leonard Covello, Principal, Benjamin Franklin High School.

Thomas E. Stone, Executive Director, New York City Coordinating Committee for Democratic Action.

Lester Granger, Secretary, Committee on Negro Welfare, Welfare Council of New York.

PANEL V—"EDUCATION AS BASIS FOR TOLERANCE AND DEMOCRACY"

1. Personal Experiences Dealing with:
  - a. Minority Discrimination in Our Schools.
  - b. Student Organization and Relations.
  - c. Faculty Organization and Relation.

2. Education and Propaganda.

3. Legislative Threats to Our Educational System.

4. What Has Been Done to Counteract Antidemocratic Tendencies in the Field of Education.

5. Practical Steps That Must Be Taken To Preserve Academic Freedom.

*Chairman of Panel:* Professor Walter Rautenstrauch, Columbia University.

*Panel Speakers:* Dr. Charles H. Fisher, former president, Western Washington College of Education.

Dr. Benjamin Harrow, College of the City of New York.

Prof. Robert K. Speer, New York University.

Dr. Bella V. Dodd, Legislative Representative, New York, State Federation of Teachers' Union.

William A. Hamm, Asst. Superintendent of Schools.

Prof. Doxey R. Wilkerson, Howard University.

This program, containing the names of the speakers, is a supplement to the original Call to the Conference issued January 3, 1940. Those organizations which have not as yet signified their intention of sending delegates, are urged to do so, by filling out and mailing without delay the Application for Credential printed below.

Discussion will be limited to domestic problems related to civil rights, minority, and neighborhood relations and to antidemocratic legislation, with special emphasis upon these problems in New York City.

The main purpose of the discussion in each Panel will be to determine the best and most fruitful methods of coping with the dangers threatening the civil rights and security of citizens in their neighborhoods and in the legislative assemblies of the state and nation, and what program of action can be developed by churches, schools, labor unions, settlements, fraternal orders and other organizations to meet these threats.

No resolutions will be entertained by the chairmen of the panels or of the general meetings.

Before adjournment of the panel meetings the delegates in each panel will nominate representatives from their respective panels for membership on the

Continuations Committee, which will be empowered by the Conference to devise means of continuing the work of the Conference.

Guest tickets are available for interested individuals. The charge for these tickets is \$1.

APPLICATION FOR CREDENTIAL

GREATER NEW YORK EMERGENCY CONFERENCE ON INALIENABLE RIGHTS

2 West 43rd Street, Room 508, New York City Pennsylvania C-7948

Name or Organization \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address \_\_\_\_\_  
 Number of members \_\_\_\_\_

Our organization will cooperate with the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights through (check participation desired).

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Organizational sponsorship and participation.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Organizational participation not involving sponsorship.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Individual observer.

We shall be represented by the following delegates or observers. (An organization may signify immediately its desire to sponsor or participate, and later register the names of its delegates or observers.)

Name of Delegate or Observer \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name of Delegate or Observer \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_

Registration Fee: \$1 per delegate or observer, with the exception of youth groups which will be charged \$.50

(Signed) Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Office \_\_\_\_\_

Each organization is entitled to two delegates or to two observers. Contributions for the support of this conference are cordially invited.

GREATER NEW YORK EMERGENCY CONFERENCE ON INALIENABLE RIGHTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	GENERAL COMMITTEE	GENERAL COMMITTEE—CON.
Robert W. Scarle, Chairman	Rabbi J. X. Cohen	Elizabeth Peel
Algernon D. Black Vice Chairman	Ambrose Doskow	Rev. A. Clayton Powell
Jean Bowie, Vice Chairman	Mary Dublin	Jean Reichard
Bertha J. Foss, Vice Chairman	Mabel Brown Ellis	Mary Simkhovitch
Robert K. Strauss, Vice Chairman	Christopher T. Emmet, Jr.	Mrs. A. H. Vixman
Paul Frankfurter, Treasurer	Samuel S. Fishzohn	Dr. Daniel Walsh
Thomas E. Stone, Secretary	Osmond K. Fraenkel	
Samuel L. M. Barlow	Winifred Frazier	SPONSORS
Dr. Leonard Covello	Rabbi Sidney Goldstein	Dorothy Andrews
Prof. Richard T. Cox	Gilbert M. Haas	Luigi Antonini
Rosalie Manning	Helen Hall	Dr. Robert W. Ashworth
Dr. Charles Obermeyer	Elizabeth Hawley	Margaret Culkin Banning
Jeanne Ratner	Joan Hellinger	George Gordon Battle
Charles I. Stewart	Hon. Stanley M. Isaacs	Hon. Charles Belous
	Prof. William Kilpatrick	Samuel M. Blinken
	Erwin H. Klaus	Van Wyck Brooks
	Charles E. Lane	Elmer Brown
	Dr. Gerald F. Machacek	William M. Callahan
	Polly Obermeyer	James B. Carey
	Margaret Parry	Hon. Emanuel Celler

SPONSORS—continued	SPONSORS—continued	SPONSORS—continued
Rev. Allan Knight Chalmers	Dr. Horace V. Kallen Milton Kaufman	Dr. Alonzo Myers Dr. Henry Newman
Dr. Emanuel Chapman	Paul Kellogg	Hon. Nathan D. Perlman
Rev. Everett R. Clinchy	Hon. Dorothy Kenyon	William Pickens
Rev. F. A. Cullen	Hon. Paul J. Kern	Hon. Justine Wise Poller
Dean Ned H. Dearborn	Freda Kirchwey	Hon. Almerindo Portfollo
Hon. Samuel Dickstein	Prof. Philip Klein	A. Phillip Randolph
Dr. John L. Elliott	Hon. Anna M. Kross	Frederick L. Reederfer
Dr. Phillips P. Elliott	Mrs. C. D. Kyle	Rev. Herman F. Reissig
Dr. Haven Emerson	Rev. John Howland	Mrs. Robert V. Russell
Dr. Henry Pratt Fairchild	Lathrop	Mgr. John A. Ryan, D. D.
M. I. Finkelstein	Richard W. Lawrence	Otto Sattler
Prof. John A. Fitch	Abraham Lefkowitz	Rose Schneiderman
Rev. George B. Ford	Rev. Henry Smith Lelpel	Dr. Guy Emery Shipler
Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick	Emil Lengyel	Rev. H. Norman Sibley
Ben Golden	Dr. Eduard C. Lindeman	Samuel S. Solender
Rabbi Herbert S. Goldstein	Harold H. Lund	Prof. Robert K. Speer
Prof. Samuel L. Hamilton	Rev. George Maier	L. Elizabeth Spofford
Rev. Ladislav Harsanyi	Sydney Maslen	Rev. Wm. B. Spofford
Dr. Charles J. Hendley	Emmet May	Vilhjalmur Stefansson
T. Arnold Hill	Hon. Vito Marcantonio	Maxwell S. Stewart
Rev. John Haynes Holmes	Dr. Rafael Angel Marin	Katherine Terrill
Jean Horie	Lewis Merrill	Eva Terry
Rev. Amos Horlacher	Rev. J. N. Moody	Prof. Harold C. Urey
Rev. William Lloyd Imes	Hon. Newbold Morris	Walter White
Dr. Alvin Johnson	Mrs. Alexander Mossman	James Waterman Wise
Mrs. Ely Jacques Kahn	Walter Mueller	Prof. Mary E. Woolley
	Prof. Gardner Murphy	Rev. Benjamin F. Wyland
	Hon. James E. Murray	

## EXHIBIT No. 15

[From the New York Times, Tuesday, January 31, 1939. Advertisement]

## AN OPEN LETTER TO THE GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

While you read this message, a major human tragedy is taking place. A question of the greatest importance to our country and to the entire world is being decided.

A brave nation is fighting against terrible odds, not only for its own independence and freedom, but for the very life of democracy everywhere.

The whole world knows now that the "Franco Revolt" is in reality an invasion. Hitler and Mussolini are bent on destroying the Spanish Republic, and with its destruction gaining vastly increased power in the campaign against the democracies. They have set out to replace a hopeful young republic with a dictatorship patterned on the Nazi and Fascist models. In the Italian and German press the fall of Barcelona was hailed as a "great victory."

With indescribable brutality and complete disregard for world opinion, they have warred against both the armies and the women and children of Spain. It is clear that they intend to use Spain as a means of crippling French and British democracy, and as a powerful springboard to South and Central America, where their agents have for years been busy spreading propaganda against democracy and for fascism.

If Franco, Hitler and Mussolini win in Spain, the fascist penetration of the Western Hemisphere will be immensely strengthened. This will mean a greatly increased defense problem for the United States.

It must not be allowed to happen! Democracy cannot permit unending aggression against it. "Appeasement" has failed. China, Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Spain witness its failure.

What can our country do? The American people want peace. They abhor aggression and warring dictatorships. They are committed to the democratic way of life.

The hard fact is that by our embargo against Spain we are giving aid to Hitler and Mussolini and all they stand for. Our embargo is helping to destroy a republic which stands as a powerful bulwark against the fascist plans. If that republic is destroyed, much of the responsibility will be ours.

The signers of this letter believe that Mr. Henry L. Stimson, former United States Secretary of State, is right when he says:

"If this Loyalist Government is overthrown, it is evident that its defeat will be solely due to the fact that it has been deprived of its right to buy from us and other friendly nations the munitions necessary for its defense."

To the plea that the United States must remain neutral, we can only reply that an embargo which permits aid to aggressors and denies it to the victim is flagrantly unneutral. In the words of President Roosevelt to the 76th Congress, "we have learned that when we deliberately try to legislate neutrality, our neutrality laws may operate unevenly and unfairly—may actually give aid to the aggressor and deny it to the victim." A policy which places a friendly, recognized, democratically-elected government on the same plane with the foreign-aided insurrectionist cannot, by any canon of law or tradition, be called neutrality. The embargo, as our most distinguished lawyers and historians have insisted, is a clear violation of international law.

We submit to our fellow Americans and to our government that every obligation of peace, of freedom, of justice, of self-interest, calls upon us to:

LIFT THE EMBARGO—WITHOUT DELAY

*It is not too late.* The Spanish Republic still lives. Its people, who still control Central Spain with Valencia and iron-willed Madrid, have no intention of surrendering. A simple act of justice on the part of The United States of America can still turn the tide in favor of democracy.

We who have signed this letter want to hear the cheer of hope and new courage that will go up in every land, including our own, when the word goes out that The United States has lifted the embargo against Spain.

American public opinion has given our government a clear mandate to act. More than 76 per cent of public opinion, according to the Gallup poll, supports the Spanish Republic.

In the name of American fair play and of all our best traditions—  
In the name of world peace and of democracy—

LIFT THE EMBARGO—NOW

(Signed) Ernest Sutherland Bates, Robert Benchley, Marc Blitzstein, Franz Bons, Mrs. Louis D. Brandeis, Louis Bromfield, Van Wyck Brooks, Matthew J. Burns, Henry Seidel Canby, Walter B. Cannon, M. D., Carrie Chapman Catt, Albert Sprague Coolidge, William E. Dodd, Sherwood Eddy, Edna Ferber, Christian Gauss, Roswell G. Ham, Dashiell Hammett, Henry T. Hunt, Edward L. Israel, Paul Kellogg, Rockwell Kent, John A. Kingsbury, Emil Lengyel, Oscar E. Maurer, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Henry Morgenthau, William Allen Neilson, Marion Edwards Park, Dorothy Parker, Charles Edward Russell, Alfred K. Stern, Paul H. Todd, Harold C. Urey, Mary E. Wolley.

THESE EMINENT AMERICANS HAVE URGED THAT THE SPANISH EMBARGO BE LIFTED

Bishop Julius W. Atwood	Rev. Francis J. McConnell	Mary K. Simkhovitch
Rev. W. Russell Bowie	Bishop Edward L. Parsons	Judge Milton E. Gibbs
Bishop Chauncey B. Brewster	Rev. Harold C. Phillips	Judge Robert W. Kenny
Rev. Hugh Elmer Brown	Rev. Daniel A. Polling	Judge Arthur Le Sueur
Rev. Raymond Calkins	Rev. Julius S. Seebach	Justice Justine Wise Polier
Bishop Ralph S. Cushman	Rabbi Stephen S. Wise	Justice James H. Wolfe
Bishop Charles K. Gilbert	Helen Hall	Hon. Charles Belous
Rev. Charles W. Gilkey	Linton B. Swift	Hon. Smith W. Brookhart
Rev. William E. Gilroy	Helen M. Harris	Prof. Leslie H. Buckler
Rev. L. O. Hartman	Elsie Voorhees Jones	Prof. Michael N. Chanalls
Rev. Ivan Lee Holt	Jessie Binford	Hon. Stanley M. Isaacs
Rev. Moses R. Lovett	Owen R. Lovejoy	Hon. Paul J. Kern
Rev. Halford E. Luccock	Mary Van Kleeck	Hon. Nathan R. Margold

THESE EMINENT AMERICANS HAVE URGED THAT THE SPANISH EMBARGO BE LIFTED—CON.

Arthur Garfield Hays	Lawrence Tibbett	Brooks Atkinson
Dorothy Kenyon	Efrem Zimballist	Stephen Vincent Benet
Louis F. McCabe	Ernest Hemingway	Pearl S. Buck
Harold Riegelman	Theodore Dreiser	Vincent Sheean
Frank P. Walsh	William Rose Benet	Dorothy Thompson
Dean Francis M. Shea	Margaret Cuklin Banning	Robert C. Clothier
Natalie Bodanya	Countee Cullen	Ada L. Comstock
John Alden Carpenter	R. L. Duffus	Henry Pratt Fairchild
Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge	Dorothy Canfield Fischer	Vida D. Scudder
Walter Damrosch	Alfred Kreymborg	Harold G. Urey
Olin Downes	Upton Sinclair	Harry F. Ward
Jessica Dragonette	John Steubbeck	Henry L. Stimson
Rosina Lhevinne	Louis Adamic	Margaret Bourke-White
Josef Lhevinne	Harry Elmer Barnes	George Biddle
Yehudi Menuhin	Charles A. Beard	Lewis Mumford
Alexander Smallens	Sherwood Anderson	John Dewey
Sigmund Spaeth	Franklin P. Adams	Daniel L. Marsh
	Maxwell Anderson	A. F. Whitney

THEY SWEPT BACK NAPOLEON; THE INVADERS OF 1939 WILL FOLLOW—IF THE EMBARGO IS LIFTED

ACT NOW! CUT OUT THIS COUPON

Capitol, Washington, D. C.

Joining with millions of other Americans of all political and religious faith, I urgently request that the Embargo against Republican Spain be lifted now so that world peace and democracy may be preserved.

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Street Address \_\_\_\_\_  
 City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

Fill in name of your Senator or Representative and mail to Brig. Gen. H. C. Newcomer, chairman, Washington Committee to Lift Spanish Embargo, room 100, 1410 M. Street NW, Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT No. 16

Hon. Paul J. Kern, chairman; Honorary vice chairmen: Hon. Henry T. Hunt, Washington, D. C.; Judge Robert W. Kenny, Los Angeles; Prof. Malcolm Sharp, University of Chicago.	John P. Davis, Washington, D. C. Hon. Hubert T. Delaney, New York John D. Denison, Des Moines Richard A. Dowling, New Orleans Osmond K. Freenkel, New York Walter Frank, New York Leo Gallagher, Los Angeles Irwin Geiger, Washington, D. C. Max Golina, Milwaukee Judge Milton E. Gibbs, Rochester Hon. Jonah J. Goldstein, New York Irvin Goodman, Portland Dean Leon Green, Northwestern University Arthur J. Harvey, Albany Prof. H. C. Havighurst, Northwestern University Arthur Garfield Hays, New York Charles H. Houston, New York Prof. Samuel Guy Inman, New York Hon. Stanley M. Isaacs, New York Dorothy Kenyon, New York Judge Arthur Le Sueur, Minneapolis	Mark M. Litchman, Seattle Hon. Vito Marcantonio, New York Hon. Nathan R. Margold, Washington, D. C. Louis F. McCabe, Philadelphia Carey McWilliams, Los Angeles Kenneth Meiklejohn, Washington, D. C. Samuel D. Menin, Denver Darwin J. Mesorole, New York Prof. William E. Mikkell, Philadelphia Earl E. Miller, Dallas Hon. Patrick H. O'Brien, Detroit Hon. Luane Pacht, Los Angeles Hon. J. Stuart Page, Rochester Nathaniel Phillips, New York Justice Justine Wise Poller, New York Walter H. Pollak, New York Leo Pressman, Pittsburgh Prof. Leon A. Ransom, Howard University S. Roy Remar, Boston
Leo J. Linder, vice chairman; Prof. Herman A. Gray, treasurer; Charles Rabbin, secretary. St. Clair Adams, New Orleans Spencer Austrian, Los Angeles S. John Block, New York George K. Bowden, Chicago Louis B. Boudin, New York James L. Brewer, Rochester Maurice C. Brigadier, Jersey City Hon. Smith W. Brookhart, Washington, D. C. Prof. Leslie H. Buckler, University of Virginia Prof. Michael N. Chandliss, University of Newark Russell N. Chase, Cleveland Dr. Felix S. Cohen, Washington, D. C. Prof. Morris R. Cohen, New York W. A. Combs, Houston Paul Coughlin, Seattle Hon. Maurice P. Davidson, New York		

EXHIBIT No. 16—Continued

Harold Riegelman, New York	Robert J. Silberstein, New York	A. Ovrum Tapper, Chicago
Mortimer Rlemer, Washington, D. C.	S. Khan Spiegel, Philadelphia	Denn William Taylor, Howard University
Hon. Lester Wm. Roth, Los Angeles	Harold Strauch, Hartford	Clare Warner, Los Angeles
Harry Sacher, New York	Prof. Wesley A. Sturges, Yale University	Ruth Weyand, Chicago
	Maurice Sugar, Detroit	Carlo Whitehead, Denver
		Justice James H. Wolfe, Salt Lake City

(Partial list)

LAWYERS COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN RELATIONS WITH SPAIN

150 Broadway

NEW YORK, N. Y.

REctor 2-8782

MARCH 5, 1938.

A. MARX LEVIEN, Esq.,  
21 E. 40th St., New York City.

DEAR SIR: We send you a Petition and Memorandum of Law on the Embargo against Spain.

The eminent members of the bar and teachers of law who sponsor and endorse the Petition and Memorandum firmly believe that the Embargo is legally untenable and that it constitutes a violation of fundamental principles of international law and an abandonment and reversal of traditional foreign policy of the United States.

We urge you to join with us in requesting the reconsideration by the President and the Congress of the policy of our government towards the republican government of Spain.

We invite you to sign the Petition and secure the signatures of your colleagues and friends in the profession. The matter is urgent and the prompt return of the enclosed petition, duly signed, is earnestly requested.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL J. KERN, *Chairman.*

EXHIBIT No. 17

Seventy organizations—settlement houses, consumers cooperatives, trade-unions, and others—sponsor the committee

Chairman:	Susan Jenkins	Advisory Board:
Vice Chairmen:	Meyer Peretnock	Ruth Beinduo
	Winnifred Freeler	Morris L. Brust
	Rose Nelson	Dr. Lewis L. Harris
Secretary:	Gladys Holland	Arthur Keller
Treasurer:	Gertrude R. Prince	Dorothy Kenyon
Executive Secretary:	Alice K. Collet	Paul J. Kern
Executive Committee:	Jack Berbach	Dr. John A. Kingsbury
	Dr. George Bersky	Henry W. Laidler
	Annie S. Bromley	Dr. Charles A. Merkes
		Frank Olmstead
		Peggy Packard
		A. Phillip Randolph
		Bernard Reis
		Rose Schneiderman
		Mary K. Shillherlich

MILK CONSUMERS PROTECTIVE COMMITTEE

Founded by Dr. CAROLINE WHITNEY

An Organization to Represent Consumer Interests

215 Fourth Avenue

GRamercy 5-4066

Chairman, Caroline Whitney Memorial Fund: ELINOR MERRELL

APRIL 23, 1940.

Hon. JOHN J. DEMPSEY,  
Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As chairman of the Milk Consumers Protective Committee, I was one of those consulted by Consumers Union in their preparation of a letter and statement which they recently sent to you asking for a thorough investigation

by your committee of the circumstances surrounding the preparation and release of the report on "Communist Work in Consumer Organizations."

The facts and questionable circumstances indicating a conspiratorial relationship between your committee's special investigator and an officer of Hearst's Magazines, Inc., are indeed, shocking. I urge that you make a thorough investigation of these disclosures. I do so not only as chairman of one of the organizations attacked in the report, but also as a citizen. Such unorthodox procedure on the part of a government body is contrary to our democratic traditions.

Respectfully,

ASHE INGERSOLL, *Chairman.*

AI: RS.

EXHIBIT No. 18

STATEMENT OF SENATOR McCARTHY ON HALDORE HANSON

The next case is that of Haldore Hanson.

This man occupies one of the most strategically important offices in the entire State Department.

It is my understanding that he joined the Department of State in February 1942, and is recognized in the Department as a specialist and expert on Chinese Affairs.

Hanson, now Executive Director of the Secretariat of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, will head up a Technical Cooperation Projects Staff of the new Point 4 Program for aid to under developed areas which will have charge of the expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars of our taxpayers' money over all the world. (Source: Department of State Departmental Announcements 41, dated February 21, 1950.)

The pro-Communist proclivities of Mr. Hanson go back to September 1938.

Hanson was a contributor to Pacific Affairs, the official publication of the Institute of Pacific Relations, whose staff was headed by millionaire Frederick Vanderbilt Field, an admitted Communist. Field has devoted his entire fortune to the Communist cause.

It is important that the committee keep in mind that Mr. Hanson also wrote for the magazine Amerasia, of which Philip Jacob Jaffe was managing editor.

Jaffe was arrested, indicted, and found guilty of having been in illegal possession of several hundred secret documents from the State, Navy, War, and other Government Department files.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me a document entitled "Department of State, Departmental Announcement 41." The heading is "Establishment of the Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development." Then in parenthesis, by way of explanation of this rather high-sounding name, we find "Point Four Program."

The first paragraph of the order reads as follows:

"1. Effective immediately there is established under the direction of the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs of the Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development (TCD)."

On page 4 we find that the chief of this Technical Cooperations Project Staff is one Haldore Hanson.

Paragraph 2 on Page 1 sets forth the following responsibilities of Hanson's division:

"The Interim Office is assigned general responsibility within the Department for (a) securing effective administration of programs involving technical assistance to economically underdeveloped areas and (b) directing the planning in preparation for the Technical Cooperation and Economic Development (Point Four) Program. In carrying out its responsibilities the Interim Office will rely upon the regional bureaus, Bureau of United Nations Affairs, and other components of Economic Affairs area for participation in the technical assistance programs as specified below, and upon the central administrative offices of the Administrative area for the performance of service functions."

From this it would appear that his division will have a tremendous amount of power and control over the hundreds of millions or billions of dollars which the President proposes to spend under his Point Four Program, or what he has referred to as the "Bold New Plan."

Hanson's appointment is not made by the President, but by the State Department and is not subject to any Senate confirmation. Therefore, it would seem



rather important to examine the background and the philosophy of this young man.

The State Department Biographical Register gives what would on its face seem to be a chronological story of an increasingly successful young man. It shows that he graduated from college, for example, in 1934 at the age of 22; that he was a teacher in Chinese colleges from 1934 to 1937; and then a press correspondent in China from 1936 to 1939; a staff writer from 1938 to 1942; then in 1942 he got a job in the State Department at \$4,600 a year; that in 1944 he was listed as a specialist in Chinese affairs at \$5,600; that in 1945 he was made Executive Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State at \$6,500; that in May of 1948 he was made assistant chief of the area division number 3; that on June 28, 1948, he was made acting chief for the Far Eastern Area, Public Affairs Overseas Program Staff; that on November 14, 1948, he was made Executive Director of the Secretariat of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation. There is certainly nothing unusual about this biography. Nothing there to indicate that this man might be dangerous in the State Department as Chief for the Far Eastern Area Public Affairs, Overseas Program Staff, during a time when the Communists were taking over China. However, much is left out of this biography. It does not show, for example, that this young man was running a Communist magazine in Peking when the Japanese-Chinese war broke out. It does not show, for example, that he spent several years with the Communist armies in China, writing stories and taking pictures which the Chinese Communists helped him smuggle out of the country. Nor does this biography show that this man, after his return from China, wrote a book—a book which sets forth his pro-Communist answer to the problems of Asia as clearly as Hitler's *Mein Kampf* set forth his solutions for the problems of Europe.

Nothing that he has said or done since would indicate that he repudiates a single line of that book.

This man clearly believes that the Communists in China stand for everything that is great and good. His is not the picture of a mercenary trying to sell his country out for thirty pieces of silver. In reading his book, you are impressed with the fact that he firmly believes the Communist leaders in China are great and good men and that all of Asia would benefit by being communized.

Take, for example, what he had to say about Mao Tse-tung, the head of the Communist Party at that time and now the Communist ruler of China, and Chu Teh, commander in chief of the 8th Route Communist Army, and according to *Life* magazine of January 23, 1950, Number Two man in prestige to Mao Tse-Tung.

In Chapter 23, entitled "Political Utopia on Mt. Wut'ai", in describing a meeting with an American Major Carlson, here is what he had to say:

"We stayed up till midnight exchanging notes on guerrilla armies, the farm unions, and the progress of the war. I was particularly interested in the Communist leaders whom Carlson had just visited and whom I was about to meet. Mao Tse-Tung, the head of the Communist Party, Carlson characterized as 'the most selfless man I ever met, a social dreamer, a genius living fifty years ahead of his time.' And Chu Teh, commander in chief of the 8th Route Army was 'the prince of generals, a man with the humility of Lincoln, the tenacity of Grant, and the kindness of Robert E. Lee.'"

For a man slated a chief of the bureau which may have the job of spending hundreds of millions of dollars throughout the world this indicates, to say the least, a disturbing amount of hero worship for the number one and number two Communist leaders in the Far East today.

On page 340, he condemns the right wing groups in the Chinese Government for "fighting against the Democratic revolution as proposed by Mao Tse Tung and the Communists."

On the same page he points out that anti-Red officials within the government were making indirect attacks upon the Communists and that "leaders of the Communist youth corps were arrested by military officers at Hankow. I myself was the victim of one of these incidents and found that local officials were the instigators."

From Hanson's book it appears that the Nationalist government knew of his close collaboration with the Communist Army. For example, on page 350, we find that his passport was seized by the police in Sian when they found that he was traveling from Communist guerrilla territory to the Communist headquarters. He states that the man responsible "for this illegal action was governor Ching Ting-Wen—one of the most rabid anti-Red officials in China. The governor's purpose was merely to suppress news about the Communists."

Before quoting further from this book written by Mr. Hanson, it might be well to give a clearer picture of the job which Secretary Acheson has picked out for him. The State Department document lists some of the duties of his bureau as follows:

1. Developing over-all policies for the program.
2. Formulating general program plans and issuing planning directives.
3. Coordinating specific program plans developed by the regional bureaus and making necessary adjustments.
4. Approving projects, determining action agencies, and allocating funds for U. S. bilateral programs.
5. Directing negotiations and relationships with intergovernmental agencies and with other U. S. agencies participating in the coordinated program or otherwise carrying on technical assistance activities.
  1. Initiating and developing plans for technical assistance programs for individual countries or groups of countries within their respective regions.
  2. Reviewing program proposals affecting their regions which originate from any other source.
  3. Negotiating and communicating with foreign governments.
  4. Directing State Department personnel assigned abroad to coordinate and give administrative and program support to bilateral programs.
  5. Continuously evaluating programs and projects within regions.
  6. Proposing program changes.
  7. Initiating instructions to the field carrying out their responsibilities and reviewing all other instructions concerned with technical assistance programs.

This gives you some idea of the tremendous powers of the agency in which Mr. Hanson is a top flight official.

Let us go back to Hanson's writings:

All through the book he shows that not only did he have complete confidence in the Communist leaders but that they also had complete confidence in him. On page 256 he refers to how Communist generals Nie and Lu (Chen-Tsao) acted as his couriers, smuggling packets of films and news stories for him with the aid of Communist guerrilla spies into Peiping.

In this connection I might say that he very frankly points out that the Communists do not tolerate anyone who is not completely on their side. Hanson makes it very clear all through the book that he is not only on the Communist side, but that he has the attitude of a hero worshiper for the Chinese Communist leaders.

His respect and liking for the Communist leaders permeates almost every chapter of the book. For example, on page 284 and page 285, he tells about how some ragged waifs whom he had gathered into his sleeping quarters regarded Mao Tse Tung and Chu Ted as "Gods." He then goes on to tell about their favorite Communist General, Holung, and states that they convinced him that Holung was a very extraordinary man whom they described as "big as a Shantungese, heavy as a restaurant cook but quick as a cat in battle." He then goes on to describe on page 285 how, when he met General Holung, he found him to be much as the hero-worshipping boys had described him. "He is," said Hanson, "a living picture of Rhett Butler from the pages of *Gone With the Wind*."

This praise of Chinese Communist leaders—goes on page after page. On page 278, he describes Communist General P'eng as the most rigid disciplinarian and "the most persistent student of world affairs."

In Chapter 26, he speaks with apparent bated breath of the "Brain Trust" of Communist leaders who were immortalized by Edgar Snow in his *Red Star Over China*.

On page 295 in referring to two other Communist generals, he says: "Should this book ever fall into Communist hands, I must record that those two lonely men made excellent company during my three weeks in Yenai."

After describing in complimentary manner this university and the students, on page 296 he says, "Every cadet divides his time between political and military subjects. On the one hand he listens to lectures on Marxian philosophy, the history of the Chinese Revolution, the technique of leading a mass movement; on the other hand he studies guerrilla tactics, the use of military maps, and the organization of a military labor corps."

On page 297 he points out that no tuition is charged at the academy and that each student is supplied with uniform, books, and food, plus a pocket allowance, and then has this to say: "Some recent visitors to Yenai have spread a report that the academies are supported by Russian rubles—a thin piece of gossip. I

was told by several Chinese leaders, including Mao Tse-Tung, that the largest contributions came from American sympathizers in New York."

On page 297 and 298, Hanson relates that in talking to one of the Nationalist war lords, "I suggested that he could learn a great deal from the Communists about discipline and integrity of leadership."

On page 303, Hanson has this to say, "My attitude toward Communist China's leaders was a mixture of respect for their personal integrity and a resentment of their suspiciousness. They impressed me as a group of hard-headed, straight-shooting realists."

After an interview with Mao Tse Tung he states, "I left with the feeling that he was the least pretentious man in Yenan and the most admired. He is a completely selfless man."

Following is Hanson's description of how the Reds took over. I quote from page 102:

"Whenever a village was occupied for the first time, the Reds arrested the landlords and tax collectors, held a public tribunal, executed a few and intimidated the others, then redistributed the land as fairly as possible."

In Chapter 28, in comparing the Communists to Chiang Kai-shek's troops, Hanson had this to say:

"I left Yenan with only one conviction about the Communists; that they were fighting against the Japanese more wholeheartedly than any other group in China."

He then goes on to condemn "Red baiting" officials in Chungking.

On page 312 of his book, Hanson quotes a Communist editor as stating as follows:

"Our relationship to the U. S. S. R. is no different than that of the American Communist Party. We respect the work of Russia's leaders and profit by their experience wherever we can, but the problems of China are not the same as those of Russia. We plan our program from a Chinese point of view."

Hanson then adds, "The explanation seemed logical enough to me."

In connection with Hanson's position as Chief of the Technical Cooperation Projects Staff, in charge of Truman's Point Four Program, the following on pages 312 and 313 of his book would seem especially significant. He quotes Mao Tse Tung as follows: "China cannot reconstruct its industry and commerce without the aid of British and American capital."

Can there be much doubt as to whether the Communists or the anti-Communist forces in Asia will receive aid under the Point Four Program with Hanson in charge?

Gentlemen, here is a man with a mission—a mission to communize the world—a man whose energy and intelligence coupled with a burning all-consuming mission has raised him by his own bootstraps from a penniless operator of a Leftist magazine in Peking in the middle thirties to one of the architects of our foreign policy in the State Department today—a man who, according to State Department announcement No. 41 will be largely in charge of the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars in such areas of the world and for such purposes as he decides.

Gentlemen, if Secretary Acheson gets away with his plan to put this man to a great extent in charge of the proposed Point Four Program, it will, in my opinion, lend tremendous impetus to the tempo at which Communism is engulfing the world.

On page 82 of his book, Hanson justifies "The Chinese Communists chopping off the heads of landlords—all of which is true," because of "hungry farmers." That the farmers are still hungry after the landlords' heads have been removed apparently never occurred to him.

On page 31 he explained that it took him some time to appreciate the appalling problems which the Chinese Communists were attempting to solve.

In Chapter 4 of Hanson's book, he presents the stock Communists' arguments for the so-called Stalin-Hitler Pact of 1939.

Secretary Acheson is now putting Hanson in the position to help the Communists solve the "appalling problems" in other areas of the world with hundreds of millions or billions of American dollars.

The obvious area in which this man will start using American money to help the Communists solve the people's problem will be Indo-China and India.

It should be pointed out that this case was brought to the attention of State Department officials as long ago as May 14, 1947. At that time, the Honorable Fred Busbey, on the floor of the House discussed this man's affinity for the Communist cause in China.

## EXHIBIT No. 19

[Department of State. Departmental Announcement 41]

## ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INTERIM OFFICE FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (POINT FOUR PROGRAM)

1. Effective immediately there is established under the direction of the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs [the Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development (TCD)].

2. The Interim Office is assigned general responsibility within the Department for (a) securing effective administration of programs involving technical assistance to economically underdeveloped areas and (b) directing the planning in preparation for the Technical Cooperation and Economic Development (Point Four) Program. In carrying out its responsibilities the Interim Office will rely upon the regional bureaus, Bureau of United Nations Affairs, and other components of Economic Affairs area for participation in the technical assistance programs as specified below, and upon the central administrative offices of the Administrative area for the performance of service functions.

3. The Interim Office has specific action responsibility for:

- (a) Developing over-all policies for the program.
- (b) Formulating general program plans and issuing planning directives.
- (c) Coordinating specific program plans developed by the regional bureaus and making necessary adjustments.
- (d) Approving projects, determining action agencies, and allocating funds for U. S. bilateral programs.
- (e) Directing negotiations and relationships with intergovernmental agencies and with other U. S. agencies participating in the coordinated program or otherwise carrying on technical assistance activities.
- (f) Reviewing instructions to the field.

4. The Interim Office will coordinate the development of operating policies governing administrative problems generally applicable to technical assistance programs such as utilization of available specialized personnel, conditions of employment, and utilization of training facilities.

5. The regional bureaus have responsibility with respect to technical assistance programs for:

- (a) Initiating and developing plans for technical assistance programs for individual countries or groups of countries within their respective regions.
- (b) Reviewing program proposals affecting their regions which originate from any other source.
- (c) Negotiating and communicating with foreign governments.
- (d) Directing State Department personnel assigned abroad to coordinate, and give administrative and program support to, bilateral programs.
- (e) Continuously evaluating programs and projects within regions.
- (f) Proposing program changes.
- (g) Initiating instructions to the field carrying out their responsibilities, and reviewing all other instructions concerned with technical assistance programs.

Responsibilities previously assigned to the regional bureaus in connection with the Philippine Rehabilitation Program, Economic Cooperation Administration Aid programs, and existing programs in Germany and Japan are not affected by this announcement except for paragraph 4 above which will apply where circumstances require.

6. The Bureau of United Nations Affairs has:

- (a) Action responsibility for:
  1. Developing the U. S. position concerning the international organizational machinery to be used in connection with technical assistance activities;
  2. Developing the U. S. position concerning the relative proportions of contributions to be made by the U. S. and by other countries to the special technical assistance accounts of international organizations;
  3. Coordinating negotiations involving such accounts.
- (b) Advisory responsibility concerning:
  1. The character and scope of technical cooperation programs undertaken by international organizations;
  2. The amounts of U. S. contributions to the special technical assistance accounts of international organizations;
  3. U. S. positions on program allocations from such accounts by international organizations.

The Bureau of United Nations Affairs maintains general contact with international organizations in line with its over-all responsibilities and arranges for direct contact between the United Nations and the participating specialized agencies and the Interim Office of Technical Cooperation and Development or U. S. agencies on operating program matters as requested by the Interim Office. The Bureau for Inter-American Affairs makes corresponding arrangements with respect to intergovernmental arrangements of the American states.

7. The following have such responsibilities in connection with technical assistance programs as are in accord with their general responsibilities set forth in the Organization Manual of the Department.

(a) The Office of Financial and Development Policy with respect to the International Bank and Monetary Fund.

(b) The Office of Transport and Communications Policy with respect to the International Telecommunication Union and the International Civil Aviation Organization.

(c) The UNESCO Relations Staff with respect to UNESCO.

8. Responsibility for the administration of the Department's scientific and technical exchange activities under the U. S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, and under the Act of August 9, 1939, authorizing the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American Republics, insofar as these activities are directly related to specific economic development projects, is transferred from the Office of Educational Exchange to the Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development. Activities which are not so related remain the responsibility of the Office of Educational Exchange. The functions, personnel, and records of the Secretariat of the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation are transferred from the Office of Education Exchange to the Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development, except for the editorial functions connected with the publication of "The Record" and the corresponding personnel and records, which remain in the Office of Educational Exchange.

9. The Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs will become the Department's representative on, and the Chairman of, the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, in place of the Assistance Secretary for Public Affairs. He will also serve as Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Technical Assistance. The Director of the Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development will serve as Vice Chairman of both committees.

10. The other offices under the Assistant Secretary of Economic Affairs advise the Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development on the economic feasibility and desirability of projects and programs, from the standpoint of their respective specialized interests; make or arrange for such economic studies and analyses as the Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development may require; and maintain liaison with U. S. and international agencies and with private organizations on matters within their respective fields of interest as necessary in the planning and operation of the technical assistance programs.

11. The Director will become a member of the Board of Directors of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. The Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development responsibilities enumerated under 3 and other paragraphs above apply in full to technical assistance activities, present and future, carried on by the Institute. The Bureau of Inter-American Affairs exercises all responsibilities listed under paragraph 5 above with respect to the Institute's program. The Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development and the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs are jointly responsible for developing such working arrangements as are necessary to insure the administration of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs as a constituent part of a coordinated technical assistance program.

12. The Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development consists of the following organizational units under the supervision of the designated officers:

Director: Leslie A. Wheeler, Ext. 3871.

Technical Cooperation Projects Staff, Chief: Haldore Hanson, Ext. 3011, 5012.

Technical Cooperation Policy Staff, Chief: Samuel P. Hayes, Jr., Ext. 4571, 4572.

Technical Cooperation Management Staff: Richard R. Brown, Director of Executive Staff, E. Ext. 2155.

(February 21, 1950.)

## EXHIBIT No. 20

## SENATOR McCARTHY'S STATEMENT ON Mrs. ESTHER CAUKIN BRUNAUER

I should now like to take up the case of Esther Cankin Brunauer, Assistant Director of Policy Liaison, UNESCO Relations Staff, Department of State, as a salary of \$9,706 a year according to the current Federal Register.

I urgently request that this committee give serious consideration to the details of this case and act immediately to ascertain the facts.

Mrs. Brunauer was for many years Executive Secretary of the American Association of University Women.

Mrs. Brunauer was instrumental in committing this organization to the support of various front enterprises, particularly in the so-called consumer field. One such instance of this activity was reported in the New York Times of April 27, 1943. In that case the American Association of University Women joined with Consumers Union, The League of Women Shoppers, and other completely Communist controlled fronts. I have explained to the committee that these organizations have been declared subversive by various governmental agencies.

Exhibit R indicates that Mrs. Brunauer presided at a Washington meeting of the American Friends of the Soviet Union. This organization has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the California Committee on Un-American Activities. The principal speaker at this meeting was Myra Page, long an avowed leader of the Communist Party and frequent writer for the Daily Worker and other Communist periodicals.

Certainly this committee has no doubts as to the domination by the Communist Party of the American Youth Congress. It has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General and other governmental agencies.

Exhibit S shows Esther Cankin Brunauer was a signer of the call to the annual meeting of the American Youth Congress in 1938.

Esther Brunauer is the wife of Stephen Brunauer, a Hungarian by birth. He is a scientist who has had the rank of Commander in the United States Navy and his scientific work has involved some of the topmost defense secrets which the armed forces of his country possess.

I think it highly important that this committee immediately, in accordance with their mandate from the Senate, obtain the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Naval Intelligence, and the State Department on the activities of Stephen Brunauer, the husband of this ranking official of the State Department.

I ask that the committee immediately seek to learn whether or not Stephen Brunauer has

1. Been the subject of a constant investigation by government agencies over a period of ten years.
2. A close friend and collaborator of Noel Field, known Communist who recently and mysteriously disappeared behind the Iron Curtain.
3. He has admitted to associates that he was a member of the Communist party.

I am reluctant to go any further into this case but I am prepared to produce competent witnesses who will testify to the importance of immediate action in this matter.

It can be readily shown that at least three government agencies have been sifting the activities of a small group of people whose work seriously threatens the security of the country.

Certainly the Communist front activities of Mrs. Brunauer are sufficient to seriously question her security status.

## EXHIBIT No. 21

## "WHO RULES IN SOVIET RUSSIA?"

A LECTURE BY MYRA PAGE, AUTHOR—EDUCATOR—LECTURER, TYPOGRAPHICAL TEMPLE, 423 G STREET, N. W., THURSDAY, JUNE 11TH, 1936, 8:30 P. M. DR. ESTHER BRUNAUER, WILL PRESIDE

"A timely and interesting discussion on a much debated subject by a well-known American writer, who has spent 2 years in The Soviet Union. Myra Page is the author of several books. Her most recent one is "Moscow Yankee." She

## IPR REGIONAL OFFICES

1151 So. Broadway Los Angeles 14, California	417 Market Street San Francisco 5, California
215 Columbia Street Seattle 4, Washington	1710 G Street, N. W. Washington 5, D. C.
Dillingham Building Annex, Halekiauila Street, Honolulu 16, T. H.	

The privilege of voting for the Board of Trustees is limited to members who are American citizens.

## THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF THE INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

is one of ten national councils in as many countries of the world. The Institute is a nonpartisan, private, research association supported by business corporations, by its members, and by Foundation grants. Its chief purpose is to provide Americans with the facts about economic, political and social developments in the Far East. It takes on stand on public policy, but through its publications and meetings provides an impartial forum within which Far Eastern specialists, who represent many points of view, may analyze issues frankly.

The American Council of the IPR publishes factual reports and studies in both book and pamphlet form, and conducts workshops, conferences, and study courses in many parts of the United States. Over two million copies of its popular pamphlets have been used by the Army and Navy, schools, colleges, and study groups.

In 1943, the Rockefeller Foundation Report called the Institute of Pacific Relations " \* \* \* the most important single source of independent studies of the problems of the Pacific Area and the Far East."

In 1945 the United States Navy awarded its Certificate of Achievement to the American Council of the IPR "in recognition of exceptional accomplishment in behalf of the United States Navy and of meritorious contribution to the national war effort."

## EXHIBIT No. 30

## PROGRAM

*Friday evening, June 14*

Opening Meeting..... 8:30 p. m.  
"Democratic Rights and National Defense"

## Speakers:

Josephine Truslow Adams, Swarthmore College.  
Walter White, Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.  
Alfred K. Stern, Chairman, National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.  
Labor Speaker (to be announced).

*Saturday afternoon, June 15*

Registration..... 1:00 p. m.  
General Session..... 1:30-2:00 p. m.

Presiding Chairman: Rev. Theodore P. Ferris, Temporary Vice-Chairman Maryland Association for Democratic Rights.

Address: Samuel L. M. Barlow, National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.

Round Table Discussions..... 2:00-4:00 p. m.

## Round Table I. Democratic Rights and Labor.

Issues involved: National Defense and Civil Liberties; the industrial mobilization plan; legislation and trade unions; anti-trust prosecutions.

## Round Table II. Democratic Rights and Minorities.

Issues involved: The attack upon the foreign born; Discrimination against the Negro; the anti-lynching Bill; anti-Semitism; civil rights of political minorities; intellectual freedom in the schools.

Saturday afternoon, June 15--Continued

Round Table III. Democratic Rights and the Church.

Issues involved: The Church and intolerance; religion in a democratic society; freedom of speech for the clergy; the responsibility of the Church in the face of attacks upon minorities.

(Chairman and Discussants of Round Tables to be announced).

Business Session----- 4:00-5:30 p. m.

Presiding Chairman: Rev. Theodore P. Ferris.

Reports by the Chairmen of Round Tables, with recommendations for action.

Election of Officers and Continuations Committee.

MARYLAND ASSOCIATION FOR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

AFFILIATED TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY CONFERENCE FOR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

FRANZ BOAS, NATIONAL HONORARY CHAIRMAN

TEMPORARY OFFICERS

Wm. F. Cochran, Chairman  
Rev. Theodore P. Ferris,  
Vice Chairman

Edna R. Walls, Secretary  
Albert Lion, Jr., Treasurer  
Bert L. Clarke, Executive Secretary

SPONSORS OF THE CONFERENCE

Mr. I. Duke Avnet	Dr. Ernst Felse	Rev. Joseph S. Nowak, Jr.
Dr. Floyd Banks	Dr. Jonas Friedenwald	Charles B. Olds
Walter Bohanan	Helen Garvin	Maizie Rappaport
Gertrude C. Bussey	Sarah Hartman	Leon Rubenstein
Marthe-Ann Chapman	Sidney Hollander	Dr. Leon Sachs
Savilla Cogswell	Dr. W. Stull Holt	C. A. B. Shreve
J. Marjorie Cook	Mrs. Anne G. Huppman	Dr. Henry E. Sigerist
Mrs. Henry E. Corner	Owen Lattimore	H. Bowen Smith
Dorothy Currie	Mrs. Owen Lattimore	William Smith
Fred D' Avila	Claire Leighton	Wm. F. Stark
Carrington L. Davis	Edward S. Lewis	Arthur K. Taylor
Mrs. Edmond S. Donoho	Charles W. Mitzel	
Jacob J. Edelman	Samuel R. Morsell	

In order to facilitate arrangements for the Conference, please return this blank to the address below as soon as possible

REGISTRATION BLANK

MARYLAND ASSOCIATION FOR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS,  
19 Medical Arts Building, Baltimore, Md.

Name -----  
Address -----

Please check your basis of participation in the Conference:

Individual -----  
Representative of an organization -----  
Organization -----  
Total membership of organization -----

(Each organization is entitled to at least two delegates. Organizations having more than 100 members are entitled to one delegate for every additional 100 members.)

Registration Fee enclosed: 25c per delegate.

EXHIBIT No. 31

WRITERS CONGRESS--1943

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, L. A. CAMPUS, WESTWOOD. JOINT AUSPICES, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, HOLLYWOOD WRITERS MOBILIZATION, FRIDAY, SATURDAY, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2, 3



## WRITERS IN WARTIME

Writers face tremendous and urgent tasks in relation to the war. The spoken and written word and the image on the screen are of crucial importance in developing civilian and military morale, in bringing the promise of victory to the countries under Axis tyranny, in cementing the unity of the United Nations, in clarifying the conditions for a just and lasting peace. In this second year of the conflict, the effective use of word and image is vital to the winning of the war.

Believing that this places a direct responsibility on all writers, and seeking to find ways and means by which the writer can understand and fulfill his obligations, the University of California and the Hollywood Writers Mobilization will hold a Congress of professional writers for the achievement of the following purposes:

To analyze propaganda techniques as weapons of victory; to sharpen the creative skill of writers by pooling their creative experience and knowledge; to investigate the most effective use of new media of expression; to strengthen firm and continuous cultural understanding among the United Nations; to mobilize the entire writing profession in a program of action for the free world of tomorrow.

*Opening session, Friday evening, 8:15 p. m., October 1, 1943*

## ROYCE HALL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Welcome.....Robert G. Sproul, President, University of California  
 Reading of message from President Franklin D. Roosevelt  
 The Writers Congress.....Marc Connelly, Ralph Freud  
 Robert Rossen, Chairman

## GREETINGS FROM THE UNITED NATIONS

Thomas Baird.....Great Britain Yu Shan Han.....China  
 Phyllis Bentley.....Great Britain Mikhail Kalatosov.....U. S. S. R.  
 Nehemias Gueiros, Enrique de Lozada, Jose Ramos, Hernane Tavares de Sa,  
 South America

## SPEAKERS

Lieut. Col. Evans Carlson, United States Marine Corps  
 Y. Frank Freeman, Motion Picture Producers Association  
 Owen Lattimore, Office of War Information  
 Col. Carlos Romulo, the Philippines  
 Walter White, N. A. A. C. P.

## GUESTS

James Cagney	Thomas Mann	Kenneth Thomson
Theodore Dreiser	Elliott Paul	Walter Wanger
D. D. Durr	Capt. Paul Perigord	Jack L. Warner
Lion Feuchtwanger	Calvin J. Smith	Col. Darryl F. Zanuck

A Cappella Choir—Director, Ray Moremen

*Saturday Morning, 10 a. m. to 12:30 p. m., October 2, 1943*

A panel discussion is a general sociological and psychological approach to a subject. A seminar treats the subject in relation to a specific, technical craft. Location of sessions will be posted at Royce Hall, Friday evening, October 1st.

## SEMINARS

*The feature film*

First Session: Dore Schary, Chairman; Sidney Buchman; William Dozier; Talbot Jennings; Col. Darryl F. Zanuck.

Treatment of the war in motion pictures. Responsibilities, accomplishments, challenges to be met. Survey of war films made and to be made. Trends in the story market. Indications for the future.

*Radio news and analysis*

Fox Case, Chairman; Harry W. Flannery; Sam Hayes; Chet Huntley; Clinton Jones; Hubbard Keavy; Nelson Pringle; Wallace Sterling.

Methods employed in assembling, rewriting, and airing the news. An actual radio news program prepared and broadcast before the audience of the seminar.

*The rôle of the press*

First Session: John Cohee, Chairman; Alexander Kaun; Robert C. Miller. War coverage. The war correspondent. Covering the home front. The labor press. The future functioning of the press in the war effort.

*Song writing in war*

Arthur Schwartz, Chairman; Ira Gershwin; Oscar Hammerstein, II; E. Y. Harburg; Leo Robin; Earl Robinson.

The contribution of the song to the war effort. The rôle of the writer. Goals to reach.

*Radio television*

Lewis Allen Weiss, Chairman; Klaus Landsberg; Gilbert Seldes.

The challenge of a new medium. Present status. The transition period. The writer in relation to television. Technical and economic implications.

*Humor and the war*

A. S. Burrows; Carroll Carroll; Cornwall Jackson; Phil Leslie; Leonard Levinson; Sam Moore; Don Quinn; Frederic Rinaldo; Melville Shavelson.

Humor in relation to the morale of the soldier and the civilian.

*Saturday Afternoon, 2 to 5 p. m., October 2, 1943*

PANELS

*The nature of the enemy*

John Wexley, Chairman; Lion Feuchtwanger; David Hanna; Mikhail Kalatsov; Dudley Nichols; Col. Carlos Romulo; Virginia Wright.

Treatment of the Enemy in films, books and radio. Survey and comparisons of Enemy types. The writer probes the Nazi "mind." How should Japan's racist political philosophy be treated by the writer? The key question: How closely are the German and Japanese people to be identified with their rulers?

*The American scene*

Robert Rossen, Chairman; Howard Estabrook; Franklin Fearing; James Felton; Bernard Gordon; Milton Merlin; Carleton F. Morse; Nat Wolff.

Tensions and dislocations at home. The family under constantly changing social and economic conditions. The psychological factors which underlie creative writing in relation to the home front.

*Indoctrination and training film*

Capt. Bernard Vorhaus, Chairman; Thomas Baird; Lt. Col. Owen Crump; Lt. Col. Evans Carlson; Maj. Harrison Jacobs; Lt. Com. J. C. Hutchinson.

The function of the training film. Reports on visual orientation courses. Showing of motion pictures exemplifying work of all branches of service.

*Saturday Evening, 7:30 to 10:30 P. M., October 2, 1943*

PANELS

*Minority groups*

Leonard Bloom, Chairman; Charlotta Bass; Carlos Bulosan; John Collier; Harry Hoiyer; Carey McWilliams; Samuel Ornitz; Dalton Trumbo; Walter White.

Historical and scientific background of the minority problems. . . The writer's treatment of the question. The Negro: Case history of a minority group.

*Pan-American affairs*

Ralph Beals, Chairman; Nehemias Gueiros; Enrique de Lozada; Jose Ramos; Hernane Tavares de Sa.

Inter-American relations in their sociological, political, and economic aspects. Educational and linguistic problems defined and examined.

*Propaganda analysis*

John B. Hughes, Chairman; Lyman Bryson; Gordon Kahn; Paul Lazarsfeld; W. E. Oliver, Charles Seipmann; Frances Wilder.

Propaganda techniques in relation to the American scene . . . The writer's influence is strengthening the home front.

*Problems of peace*

Gordon S. Watkins, *Chairman*; Phyllis Bentley; Yu Shan Han; Vladimir Pozner; Robert Riskin.

Postwar internal planning. Postwar international cooperation . . . Cultural understanding among nations . . . The writer and his new audience.

*Sunday Morning, 10 a. m. to 12:30 p. m., October 3, 1943*

SEMINARS

*Writers in exile*

Phyllis Bentley, *Chairman*; Gustave Ayt; Lion Feuchtwanger; Thomas Mann; Alexis Minotis; Capt. Paul Perigord.

The exiled writer's relation to his home country. His creative and economic problems . . . His return to his home country in the postwar world.

*The role of the press*

*Second Session*; Hobart Montee; Morris Watson.

War coverage . . . The war correspondent . . . Covering the home front . . . The labor press . . . The future functioning of the press in the war effort.

*Short-wave radio*

Glan Heisch, *Chairman*; John Burton; E. T. Buck Harris; Lt. Col. Tom Lewis; Larry Rhine.

Short-wave radio programs for our troops abroad . . . Propaganda uses . . . Actual illustrations of psychological warfare broadcasts by radio Tokyo . . . and by U. S. stations.

*The documentary film*

Leo Hurwitz, *Chairman*; Thomas Baird; James Wong Howe; Joris Ivens; Kenneth Macgowan; Sgt. Ben Maddow; Arthur Mayer.

The morale film . . . Wartime documentaries in commercial theaters . . . Comparison of work accomplished in various United Nations.

*Music and the war*

Lou Cooper; Hanns Eisler; Gerald Strang.

Music as an integral element of film and radio . . . The demands placed upon music by the war.

*Sunday Afternoon, 2 to 5 p. m., October 3, 1943*

SEMINARS

*The feature film*

*Second Session*; Thomas Baird; Thomas Chapman; Jorge Delano, Sr.; Mikhail Kalatosov; Robert Rossen.

The United Nations. Speakers from the British and Russian film industries. A comparative survey. Concrete proposals for more effective screen writing in terms of content and technique.

*The animated cartoon*

Phil Eastman, John Huble, Karl van Lueven.

The unique position of the animated cartoon among war films . . . New opportunities for the writer and for the artist . . . Social and educational aspects.

*Creative radio*

Paul Franklin, *Chairman*; Hector Chevigny, Norman Corwin, Ramald MacDongall, Arch Oboler, Jack Runyon, Bernard Schoenfeld.

The radio dramatist in wartime . . . The commercial writer . . . Documentary radio . . . Evaluation of current tendencies . . . The future of creative radio writing.

*Publicity and the war*

Cecil Carl, *Chairman*.

The role of the motion picture publicist . . . Exploitation and advertising in the war effort.

1540 STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

Sunday Evening, 7:30 to 10:30 p. m., October 3, 1948

CONCLUDING SESSION: ROYCE HALL—REPORTS FROM PANELS AND SEMINARS;  
RESOLUTIONS—PROGRAM OF ACTION

(Meals will be served on the Campus at nominal prices)

COMMITTEES OF THE WRITERS CONGRESS

CO-CHAIRMEN

Marc Connelly; Ralph Freud

TREASURER

Francis Edwards Faragoh

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Gustave Arlt	Francis H. Harmon	Carl Sandburg
Sidney Buchman	John B. Hughes	Dore Schary
Fox Case	Joris Ivens	Arthur Schwartz
Marc Connelly	Stephen Longstreet	Robert G. Sproul
Jean Dalrymple	Alfred E. Longuell	Rex Stout
William Dozier	Kenneth Macgowan	Lamar Trotti
Charles Einfeld	Mary C. McCall, Jr.	Walter Wanger
Franklin Fearing	William Morris, Jr.	Jack L. Warner
Y. Frank Freeman	Dudley Nichols	Walter White
Ralph Freud	Mark Sandrich	Col. Darryl F. Zanuck

GENERAL COMMITTEE

Gustave Arlt	Howard Koch	Arch Oboler
Bill Blowitz	John Howard Lawson	W. E. Oliver
Richard Collins	Melvin Levy	H. R. Reynolds
Franklin Fearing	Alfred E. Longuell	Allen Rivkin
Paul Franklin	Milton Merlin	Robert Rossen
Sheridan Gibney	Josef Mischel	Zachary Schwartz
Talbot Jennings	Sam Moore	

Publicity direction, Vic Shapiro and staff; executive secretary, Jane Mead

COMMITTEES ON PANELS AND SEMINARS

<i>Minority groups</i>	<i>Propaganda analysis</i>	<i>Problems of peace—Con.</i>
Ring Lardner, Jr., Chairman	Franklin Fearing, Chairman	Sheridan Gibney
Charles Brackett	Ben Barzman	Richard Hocking
Edward Dymtryk	Sidney Carroll	Sgt. Bob Lee
Everett Freeman	John Houseman	Milton Merlin
Don Hartman	John B. Hughes	Hugh Miller
Harry Holzer	Sidney James	W. E. Oliver
Robert Josephs	H. R. Reynolds	Caroline Pratt
Carey McWilliams	Cameron Shipp	Hans Reichenbach
David Robison	Frances Wilder	Paul Trivers
Frank Tuttle		<i>Pan-American affairs</i>
<i>Nature of the enemy</i>	<i>American scene</i>	Louis Solomon, Chairman
John Wexley, Chairman	Robert Rossen, Chairman	Irwin Braun
Frances Goodrich	Edward Chodorov	J. Robert Bren
Albert Hackett	Howard Estabrook	Enrique de Lozada
David Hertz	Franklin Fearing	Hernane Tavares de Sa
Dan James	F. Hugh Herbert	Gerald Smith
Emmett Lavery		Guy Endore
Stephen Longstreet	<i>Problems of peace</i>	Manuel Gonzales
Marva Ross	Melvin Levy, Chairman	Jackson Leichter
Allan Scott	Bill Blowitz	Kenneth Macgowan
	George Corey	Joan Madison

## COMMITTEES ON PANELS AND SEMINARS—continued

<i>Pan-American affairs—</i>	<i>Creative radio—Con.</i>	<i>Humor and the war—Con.</i>
Continued	Sam Moore	Melvin Frank
H. R. Reynolds	Wendell Williams	Leonard Levinson
Allen Rivkin	<i>Radio news and analysis</i>	Phil Leslie
Waldo Salt	Fox Case, Chairman	Sam Moore
Leo Townsend	<i>Radio shortwave</i>	Norman Panama
Marion Zeitlin	Glan Hensch, Chairman	Don Quinn
<i>Feature film</i>	Georgia Backus	Frederic Rinaldo
Richard Collins, Chair-	<i>Publicity and war</i>	Fred Saldy
man	Tom Alfred	Melville Shavelson
William Dozier	Bill Blowitz	<i>Arrangements</i>
Talbot Jennings	Cecil Carle	Francis Edwards Fara-
Fay Kanin	Lou Harris	goh, Chairman
Michael Kanin	<i>Role of press</i>	Milton Merlin, Vice-
Howard Koch	H. R. Reynolds, Chairman	Chairman
Dudley Nichols	Charles Cosgrove	Gustav Arit
Maurice Rapf	Donald MacDonald	Fox Case
Meta Reis	John Maloney	Franklin Fearing
Dore Schary	W. E. Oliver	Ralph Freud
Lamar Trotti	Robert Tonge	Fred Grable
<i>Documentary film</i>	<i>Writers in exile</i>	Hy Kraft
Joris Ivens, Chairman	Josef Mischel, Chairman	John Howard Lawson
Bernard Gordon	Gustave Arit	Stephen Longstreet
Ian Hunter	Kurt Neumann	Alfred E. Longuell
Jay Leyda	<i>Song writing in war</i>	Melvin Levy
<i>Training films</i>	Earl Robinson, Chairman	Mrs. Robert Rossen
Capt. Bernard Vorhaus,	Leo Robin	Herman Rotsten
Chairman	Arthur Schwartz	Adrian Scott
Lt. Commander J. C. Hut-	<i>Music and the war</i>	Jack Stanley
chinson	Carroll Hollister, Chair-	Mrs. William Wylor
Major Harrison Jacobs	man	<i>Publicity</i>
Lt. Fanning Hearon	Mischa Altman	Bill Blowitz
Sgt. Stanley Rubin	Florence Byrens	John Clark
Corp. Alex Greenberg	Sol Kaplan	John Flinn
Henry Blankfort, Jr.	Gale Kubik	Chandler Harris
Edgar Peterson	Lydia Marcus	Jerry Hoffman
<i>Animated cartoon</i>	Earl Robinson	Leonard Neubauer
Zachary Schwartz, Chair-	Gerald Strang	George Thomas, Jr.
man	Cyril Towbin	<i>Tickets</i>
Graham Heid	<i>Humor and the war</i>	Jane Murfin, Chairman
Winston Hibler	Stanley Roberts, Chair-	Harold Buchman
Sgt. John Hubley	man	Earl Felton
William King	A. S. Burrows	Robert E. Kent
Karl Van Leuven	Julius Epstein	Lewis Meltzer
Norman Wright	<i>Creative radio</i>	Ann Roth Morgan
Arch Oboler, Chairman	Arch Oboler, Chairman	Frank Partos
Bernard Schoenfeld	Bernard Schoenfeld	Marguerite Roberts
		Stanley Roberts
		Richard Weil

## GUILDS PARTICIPATING IN THE HOLLYWOOD WRITERS MOBILIZATION

Robert Rossen, Chairman  
 Paul Franklin, Vice Chairman  
 Pauline Lauber Finn, Executive Secretary

Screen Writers Guild	Screen Cartoonists Guild
Radio Writers Guild	American Newspaper Guild
Screen Publicists Guild	Independent Publicists Assn.
Screen Readers Guild	Song Writers Protective Association

1655 NORTH CHEROKEE, HOLLYWOOD 28, CALIFORNIA

## EXHIBIT No. 32

## SENATOR MCCARTHY'S STATEMENT ON GUSTAVO DURAN

The Committee will recall that the name of Gustavo Duran was first mentioned by me as a possible bad security risk in a speech which I made in Reno, Nevada.

At that time I said: "Now, let's see what happens when individuals with Communist connections are forced out of the State Department. Gustavo Duran, who was labeled as (I quote) 'a notorious international Communist,' was made assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American Affairs. He was taken into the State Department from his job as a lieutenant colonel in the Communist International Brigade. Finally, after intense congressional pressure and criticism, he resigned in 1946 from the State Department—and ladies and gentlemen, where do you think he is now? He took over a high-salaried job as Chief of Cultural Activities Section in the Office of the Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations."

This statement was promptly ridiculed by the Secretary of State who—through Mr. Peurifoy—merely said that this man Duran was no longer an employee of the State Department, but had been in the auxiliary foreign service from January 1943 until September 1945, and thereafter until October 4, 1946, in the Department. Mr. Peurifoy added that Duran had voluntarily resigned from the State Department on October 4, 1946.

One of the important facts that the Secretary overlooked in making this press release is that this man is still, as of today, a high salaried official in the United Nations. On March 8th my office phoned the office of Trygve Lie to find out exactly what type of work he was doing. My office was advised that information could not be given to me. The State Department advised me that Duran is now Chief of the Cultural Activities Section of the Department of Social Affairs, United Nations.

I was surprised to find that the Permanent Secretary of the United Nations felt he could not give to a United States Senator the information as to what this man was doing. However, since that time I have had the matter checked in New York and am informed he is actually with the International Refugee Organization, engaged in work having to do with screening refugees coming into this country. The financial contribution which the United States makes toward the running of this United Nations' agency amount to 45.57 percent. (Senate Report 1274, 81st Congress, 2d Session, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, prepared by Subcommittee on Relations with International Organizations.)

At the time that Acheson's man attempted to ridicule my statement, he either did not know the facts in the case or he was covering up the information which is in the files and which should have been known to him.

This information, which I shall document for the committee, was known or was available to the State Department. It shows that Duran was (1) well-known for his rabid Communist beliefs and activities, (2) that he was active in secret Soviet operations in the Spanish Republican Army, (3) that a highly confidential report was sent to the State Department by the Military Attaché at the American Embassy in Madrid which according to all existing rules called for Duran's immediate dismissal—unless the facts were proven to be wrong. Originally, I understand it was claimed that this was a case of mistaken identity. That claim, I believe, has been subsequently dropped in view of the fact that our intelligence produced pictures of him in the uniform that he wore at the time he was the regional head of SIM, which was the Spanish Counterpart of the Russian NKVD or OGPU. I now hand the committee one of those pictures.

At the time this intelligence report reached the State Department, Duran was a highly placed official in a confidential capacity with the State Department in South America.

When the American people read the carefully prepared statement put out by the Secretary of State's office in regard to the Duran statement, they were entitled to rely upon it as being the truth. Unfortunately, anyone who believed that statement got a completely erroneous impression of the actual facts.

Whichever way you wish to interpret this situation I submit to the Committee that it is typical of the carelessness of the top executives of the State Department of this country. The situation I have just discussed is typical of the type of news releases emanating from the State Department; it is typical of the half truths we hear in answer to the information which I have been developing in regard to the bad security risks in that Department.

I now submit to the committee the Intelligence Report just referred to in its entirety. It will be noted the State Department received a copy of it. There are certain matters discussed in this report which I do not feel should be made public until the committee has had a chance to thoroughly look into them. I have, therefore, deleted these sections from the copies being handed to the press and will not read them into the record at this time. The entire report, however, with nothing deleted is being handed to each of the members of the committee.

B. I. D. No. 7232.  
Report No. R-290/46.

CONFIDENTIAL INTELLIGENCE REPORT FOR GENERAL USE BY ANY U. S. INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

JUNE 4, 1946.

From: Military Attaché, American Embassy, Madrid, Spain.  
Source: Spanish Army Central General Staff. B-3.  
Area Reported On: Spain.

Who's Who: Gustavo DURAN.

Following is the report given the Military Attaché by the A. C. of S., G-2, Spanish Central General Staff, after the M/A asked whether DURAN was known:

1. "Gustavo DURAN came to Madrid for the first time in the nineteen twenties from the Canary Island, in the company of another Canarian, a painter called Nestor, who was registered by the Spanish police for the same reasons as Duran \* \* \*. As a friend of Nestor, Gustavo Duran became employed as a pianist in the company of Antonia Merce the 'Argentinita' and went to Berlin to participate in that capacity in dance shows. However, his \* \* \* caused him to incur the fury of the Berlin police, which finally ousted him from Germany.

2. "Similar trouble happened to him in other European capitals. His \* \* \* grew to the limit in Paris, which was the preferred center for his activities some years before the advent of the Spanish Republic in 1931, while he was under the protection of his friend Nestor, the painter, who was well known in certain Parisian quarters. About that time the Soviets entrusted Gustavo Duran with some missions and finally appointed him their agent.

3. "Upon the proclamation of the Spanish Republic, the 'Porcelana' (as he was nicknamed) returned to Madrid. His identity papers indicated that he was the representative of the Paramount Film Co. However, his true mission was service of the GPU. Duran was greatly successful in his activities due to the political protection he enjoyed. He soon became one of the leading members of the Youths of the Communist Party and greatly contributed to the merger of the Communist Youths with the youths of the Spanish Labor Party, thus giving birth to the JSU ('Juventudes Socialistas Unificadas'—United Socialist Youths), of fateful remembrance, since this organization committed the most cold-blooded crimes before 18 July 1936 (date of the military uprising) and during the Red revolution which ensued.

4. "During the republican regime (1931-1936) Duran continued practicing his \* \* \*. Together with other 'close' friends of his and some young pro-Communist poets, among whom Alberty was noted, Duran succeeded in becoming notorious. All them were his tools and all them were made into active Communists. In Duran's home located \* \* \*, such meetings took place that the police had to interfere frequently, thus giving occasion to complete his record as \* \* \* in the files of the General Directorate of Security. This record as \* \* \* was probably removed by his friend Serrano Poncela, who was the Chief of the 'Red' Police during the months of October and November 1936 in Madrid and political reporter of 'Mundo Obrero' (a Communist newspaper) and Chief of the JSU Duran's release from his frequent imprisonments for \* \* \* conduct was due to his powerful political protectors, who blindly obeyed orders from the Soviet political police.

5. "Upon the national uprising (beginning of Civil War) Gustavo Duran took over the nearest convent to his house, called 'las Siervas de Maria,' located at the old Chamberi Plaza. He was there the 'responsable', or chief. He was afflicted there with typhoid fever during the month of August 1936.

The "Cause General" (General Judicial Proceedings) has information about the crimes perpetrated by the militia under the command of Duran's "chocho" (illegal prison). He was one of the principal leaders of the popular militia created by the Communists. He was a personal friend of Lister and Modesto (commanders of Red brigades, now Generals in the Russian Army) and soon

became captain, major and lieutenant colonel of the "Red" Army. He belonged to the General staff of the "Red" forces which directed the "brilliant" withdrawals of Talavera de la Reina, Maqueda, Toledo, etc.

6. "When the international brigades were brought into the Madrid and Aranjuez fronts, Gustavo Duran formed part of the High Russian General Staff, with headquarters at Tarancón and its vicinity, where they left sad and hideous recollections.

7. "After Tarancón we (the Spanish Intelligence Service) lost track of Duran. It appears that he went to Moscow with a delegation of male and female members of the "Red" Army. It appears that later he was for some time in Paris.

8. "And now he is in Washington as a collaborator of Spruille Braden, Chief of a Section of the State Department."

9. M. A. Comment: A very reliable Spaniard who is anti-Franco in sympathies but is middle of the road republican and extremely pro-U. S. and democratic in his views states that he knows personally that DURAN as commander officer of an international brigade in a small town not far from Madrid ordered the execution of the town electrician and another man who was a mason, neither of whom has committed any act for which they should have suffered this execution.

1332 WENDELL G. JOHNSON,  
Colonel, G. S. C., Military Attaché.

The Honorable Kenneth S. Wherry wrote to the State Department on August 2, 1946, demanding the immediate discharge of Duran. I now submit this letter:

AUGUST 2, 1946.

The Honorable JAMES F. BYRNES,  
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY: As a member of the Appropriation Committee, on April 18, 1946, I asked for investigation of certain persons holding positions of trust and responsibility in your Department.

It was my purpose then and is now to withhold appropriations that finance the salaries and activities of anyone in the State Department whose allegiance apparently is to some other country rather than to the United States.

You will recall, Mr. Secretary, that when you appeared I questioned you about some of these officials and among them was a Gustavo Duran. This was just prior to the Carter Glass funeral. At that time you stated there was a question of identity of Gustavo Duran. You stated further an investigation had revealed that he was some other person than the man in the State Department, who has been an assistant to Spruille Braden.

It has now come to my knowledge there exists an extensively military intelligence report on this man, Gustavo Duran, and I am reliably informed that several copies of this report have been delivered to the State Department.

I am now making this formal request upon you in my official capacity as a United States Senator, and as a member of the State Department Subcommittee on Appropriations, that on the basis of this report you immediately discharge Gustavo Duran.

Cordially yours,

KENNETH S. WHERRY.

KSW: emn

After Senator Wherry wrote this letter to the State Department, demanding the immediate discharge of Duran, he received on September 14, 1946, the following letter from Mr. Donald Russell, the Assistant Secretary of State.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, September 14, 1946.

The Honorable KENNETH S. WHERRY,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of your recent inquiry about the security investigation by the Department of Mr. Gustavo Duran. As you know, the Department has a Security Committee which confines itself to reviewing security investigations and to making recommendations based thereon. Of course, this committee has nothing to do with reviewing the qualifications or competency of the person reviewed for a position in the Department other than as security is involved. I have added this because from our conversation I would assume that you seriously question the qualifications of Mr. Duran for employment, as distinguished from security consideration. That phase of Mr. Duran's employment is not within the scope of the Security Committee.



Mr. BOYD. I understand, then, that the defense has completed their cross-examination with the exception of one item.

Inspector PHELAN. So I understand with the exception of possible questioning on that further item, if counsel decides to do that.

It seems that counsel isn't prepared to go any further anyhow, so that, at the moment, that leaves us in the position of going ahead with some other witness. If later there is any argument or dispute, we will have to argue it or dispose of it as it comes up.

Call your next witness.

Mr. BOYD. I understand that Mr. Budenz is [p. 201] excused at this time?

Inspector PHELAN. Unless he is recalled at some future date.

Mr. SACHER. The point is this: I will know this afternoon whether he is to be recalled or not. I would therefore suggest that, so you can have some continuity in the record, that if I am in a position this afternoon to indicate that I want him back, I will indicate that to Mr. Boyd.

Mr. BOYD. Is there a possibility of calling him this afternoon?

Mr. SACHER. I do not think so, because I doubt if I will have it within an hour.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Budenz will not be available tomorrow morning in any event. At least, he will not be available until tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. SACHER. All right. If this comes, I will be just as happy to have him in the afternoon as in the morning.

#### EXHIBIT No. 84

##### LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO "PACIFIC AFFAIRS" MARCH 1934 TO JUNE 1941

Allen, E. W.:	"The North Pacific Fisheries".....	June 1937.
Allen, J. S.:	"The Philippine Problem Enters a New Phase" ..	June 1938.
	"Agrarian Tendencies in the Philippines".....	March 1938.
"Asiaticus":	"Soviet Relation with Japan".....	September 1941.
	"China's Advance from Defeat to Strength".....	March 1938.
	"The New Era in Chinese Railway Construction" ..	September 1937.
	"The Financial Cutting Edge in the Partition of China."	June 1936.
Angus, H. F.:	"Canada and Naval Rivalry in the Pacific".....	June 1935.
	"The Portent of Social Credit in Alberta".....	September 1936.
"Anon.":	"On the Question of Being 'Pro' or 'Anti'".....	December 1938.
	"The 'War Potential' of the Soviet Union".....	March 1939.
Ballis, W.:	"Soviet Russia's Asiatic Frontier Technique: Tana Tuva."	March 1941.
Barnes, J.:	"Soviet Sinology".....	September 1934.
	"The Social Basis of Fascism".....	March 1936.
	"The Wooden Horse Inside Geneva's Gates".....	December 1934.
Barnes, K.:	"Another Perspective".....	December 1935.
	"Eastward Migration Within the Soviet Union" ..	December 1934.
Bell, Sir Charles:	"Tibet and its Neighbors".....	December 1937.
Benitez, C.:	"The New Philippine Constitution".....	December 1935.
Bertram, J.:	"'Neutrality' and Personal Opinion".....	September 1939.
Bishop, C. W.:	"The Beginnings of North and South in China."	September 1934.
Bisson, T. A.:	"Japan Without Germany".....	December 1939.
Boeke, J. H.:	"The Recoil of Westernization in the East".....	September 1936.
Bloch, K.:	"'Guns' and 'Butter' in Japan".....	December 1941.
	"Letter to the Editor, concerning Sanctions Against Japan."	December 1939.
	"Far Eastern War Inflation".....	September 1940.
	"Guerilla Warfare".....	September 1939.
	"Chinese Population Problems".....	June 1939.
Boeke, J. H.:	"The Economic Crisis and Netherlands India" ..	March 1934.
de Booy, H. Th.:	"The Naval Arm of Diplomacy in the Pa- cific."	March 1935.
	"The Life Lines of the British Empire".....	June 1937.
Bousquet, G. H.:	"The International Position of Netherlands India."	December 1939.

## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO "PACIFIC AFFAIRS" MARCH 1934 TO JUNE 1941—Con.

- Brady, R. A. and Taylor, W. H.: "Policy Centralization in Japan under the Kokutai Principle." March 1941.
- Bradley, A.: "Pacific Affairs Bibliographies" No. VIII: "Trans-Pacific Relations of Latin America." March 1941.
- Brancho, Jean-Yves le: "The French Colonial Empire and the Popular Front Government." June 1937.
- Brandt, W.: "The United States, China, and the World Market." September 1940.
- "Economic and Living Standards—American and Asiatic." June 1941.
- "A British Observer": "To Have and to Hold" September 1938.
- "A British Observer": "The Future Foreshadowed: China's New Democracy." December 1938.
- Britton, R. S.: "Chinese News Interests" June 1934.
- Brown, H.: (Letter) March 1939.
- Burpee, L. J.: "Would Canada Support Britain?" June 1939.
- Bywater, H. C.: "Japanese and American Naval Power in the Pacific." June 1935.
- Campbell, P.: "The American Wheat Program" September 1934.
- Canniff, A. W.: "The Rate of Growth in the Soviet Union" June 1938.
- Carlson, Evans F.: (Letter) "The Guerilla War in China" June 1939.
- "The Chinese Mongol Front in Suiyuan" September 1939.
- Cartwright, S.: "Legislation and Economics in Canada" September 1934.
- Chamberlin, W. H.: "The Moscow Trials" September 1938.
- Chang, C. F.: "Mukden—Where the Road to Madrid Began" March 1937.
- Chapman, R. N.: "Suit to Test Hawaii's Status" December 1934.
- Chen, Chia-Keng: "A 'South Seas' Chinese Reports on the Burma Road." December 1941.
- Chen, H. S.: "Conquest and Population" June 1937.
- "A Critical Survey of Chinese Policy in Inner Mongolia." December 1936.
- "The Good Earth of China's Model Province" September 1936.
- Christian, J. L.: "Trans-Burma Trade Routes to China" June 1940.
- "Thailand Renascent" June 1941.
- Chu, Coehing: "The Aridity of North China" June 1935.
- Chi, Chao-ting: "The Economic Basis of Unity and Division in Chinese History." December 1934.
- Cia. General de Tabacos de Philipinas: "A Denial of Some Statements by J. S. Allen." December 1938.
- Coatman, J.: "The British Meat Trade and British Imperial Economics." June 1935.
- Cowie, D.: "The Arming of Australia and New Zealand" September 1938.
- "British Defense of the South Pacific" September 1935.
- Creel, H. G.: "Soldier and Scholar in Ancient China" September 1935.
- Davies, C. H.: "Tobacco-Planting in the Philippines" September 1939.
- Dean, E. P.: "Toward a More Perfect Canadian Union" December 1940.
- De Korne, J. C.: "Sun Yat-sen and The Secret Societies" December 1934.
- Dupuy, R. E.: "The Nature of Guerilla Warfare" June 1939.
- Eggleston, F. W.: "Sea Power and Peace in the Pacific" September 1935.
- "The Population Problems in Australia" December 1936.
- Emerson, R.: "The Chinese in Malaysia" September 1934.
- Farrelly, T. S.: "Early Russian Contact with Alaska" June 1934.
- Field, F. V.: "The Documentation of the Yosemite Conference." December 1936.
- "American Far Eastern Policy, 1931-37" December 1937.
- Fisher, G. M.: "Main Drives Behind Japanese Policies" December 1940.
- "The Cooperative Movement in Japan" December 1938.
- Friedman, I. S.: "Indian Nationalism and the Far East" March 1940.
- Friters, G. M.: "The Prelude to Outer Mongolian Independence." June 1937.
- "The Development of Outer Mongolian Independence." September 1937.
- Fuchs, W.: "The Personal Chronicle of the First Manchu Emperor." March 1936.

## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO "PACIFIC AFFAIRS" MARCH 1934 TO JUNE 1941—Con.

Glazebrook, G. deT.: "British Empire Migration".....	December 1934.
Glazer, S.: "The Moros as a Political Factor in Philippine Independence."	March 1941.
Go, Toshi: "The Future of Foreign Concessions in China".....	December 1939.
Goldenburg, H. C.: "Reform and Politics in Canada".....	March 1936.
Goodrich, L. C.: "China's Greatest Book".....	March 1934.
Grajdanzev, A.: "Growing Difficulties with Raw Materials for Special Steels".....	December 1940.
"A Sudden Increase of Defense Expenditures in the Soviet Budget".....	December 1940.
"The Trans-Siberian Railway and the Problem of Soviet Supply".....	December 1941.
"Profit and Loss in Manchuria".....	June 1935.
Green, E.: "Indian Minorities under the American New Deal".....	December 1945.
Green, O. M.: "Great Britain and Japan's War in China".....	June 1938.
Greenberg, M.: "The Soviet-German War and The Far East".....	September 1941.
Gull, E. M.: "The Powers and the Unity of China".....	March 1937.
Hager, R.: "The Amenities of Travel".....	December 1935.
Hanson, H.: "The People Behind the Chinese Guerrillas".....	September 1938.
(Letter) "The Guerrilla War in China".....	June 1939.
Handy, E. C. S.: "Human Resources and Civilization".....	September 1935.
Hall, R. E.: "Americans Look at their Far Eastern Policy".....	June 1937.
Hanwell, N. D.: "The Dragnet of Local Government in China".....	March 1937.
Hodson, H. V.: "The Nemesis of National Planning".....	March 1936.
Holland, W. I.: "Chi-Ming Chiao's Study of Chinese Rural Pop".....	March 1934.
Howard, H. P.: "The Diplomatic Prelude to the China War".....	September 1941.
Hsiang, C. Y.: "Mountain Economy in Szechuan".....	December 1941.
Hsu Shuhsi: "The North China Problem: Letter from the Author".....	December 1937.
Hsu, I. S.: "Rural Reconstruction in China".....	September 1937.
Hubbard, L. E.: "A Capitalist Appraisal of the Soviet Union".....	June 1938.
Hubbard, G. E.: "Jellyfish and Crustacean".....	March 1936.
Hubbard, L. E.: "The Standard of Living in the Soviet Union".....	September 1938.
Hutton, D. G.: "Mexico and the Pacific".....	June 1938.
Isaacs, H. R.: "Perspectives of the Chinese Revolution: A Marxist View".....	September 1935.
Janeway, E.: "Japan's War Hunger".....	March 1938.
Jenkins, D. R.: "Policy and Strategy of the New Zealand Labor Party".....	March 1939.
Jessup, P. C.: "Determinants of a Sino-Japanese Settlement: An Impression of the I. P. R. Study Meeting".....	March 1940.
Kantorovich, A. J.: "The Sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway".....	December 1935.
Keesing, F. M.: "Standards of Living Among Native Peoples of the Pacific".....	March 1935.
Kerner, R. J.: "America's Interest and Britain's Policy".....	September 1938.
Landon, K. P.: "The Problems of the Chinese in Thailand".....	June 1940.
Lang, Olga: "Recent Russian Literature on Buriat Mongolia".....	March 1940.
"The Good Iron of the New Chinese Army".....	March 1939.
Lapomarede, Baron De: "The Setting in Malaysia".....	September 1934.
Lasker, B.: "The Philippines".....	March 1934.
"A German Analysis of Japan's Destiny".....	March 1934.
"Propaganda as an Instrument of National Policy".....	June 1937.
Lawrence, O. L.: "Competition in the World Textile Market".....	June 1934.
Leder, E.: "Fascist Tendencies in Japan".....	December 1934.
Lederer, E.: (Letter to Editor).....	September 1937.
Leung, G. K.: "Cross-Currents in the Chinese Theater".....	December 1935.
Levy, R.: "French Neutrality during the Sino-Japanese Hostilities.".....	December 1938.
"Relations of China and Japan".....	June 1939.
"A French 'Ottawa'; The Imperial Conference".....	March 1936.
Lewis, A. B.: "Chinese Currency Policy".....	March 1936.
"Silver and Chinese Economic Problems".....	March 1935.
Lieu, D. K.: "China and the Silver Question".....	September 1934.
"The Sino-Japanese Currency War".....	December 1939.

## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO "PACIFIC AFFAIRS" MARCH 1934 TO JUNE 1941—Con.

Lilienthal, P. E.: Pacific Affairs Bibliography No. VII: "Documentation of the Virginia Bench Study Meeting."	March 1940.
Lin, Yu: "Twin Loyalties in Siam"-----	June 1936.
Lowdermilk, W. C.: "Man-Made Deserts"-----	December 1935.
Ma Ning: "Agrarian Democracy in Northwest China"-----	December 1940.
MacGibbon, R. A.: "The Adoption of Wheat to Northern Regions."	December 1934.
MacKenzie, N.: "Legal Status of Aliens"-----	June 1938.
Magistretti, W.: "Japan's New Order in the Pacific"-----	June 1941.
Max, Alfred: "Against a Far Eastern Munich"-----	June 1939.
Matsukata, S.: "A Hist. Study of Capitalism in Japan"-----	March 1934.
Michael, F.: "Japan's Special Interest in China"-----	December 1937.
"The Significance of Puppet Governments"-----	December 1939.
Miller, J. C.: "The Drama in China's Anti-Japanese Propaganda."	December 1938.
Milner, I. F. A.: "New Zealand's Security in the South Pacific"-----	June 1939.
Mirkowich, N.: "Economic Growth of the Pacific Area"-----	December 1940.
Moore, H.: "The Soviet Press and Japan's War on China"-----	March 1938.
Abstract of "America v. Borbeza Kitai" by Kantorovich.	September 1936.
"Years of Fulfillment"-----	June 1936.
Nash, V.: "A Key to the Maze of Chinese Literature"-----	September 1936.
Normano, J. F.: "Japanese Emigration to Brazil"-----	March 1934.
Norins, M. R.: "Tribal Boundaries of the Burma-Yunnan Frontier."	March 1939.
"The War in China and the Soviet Press"-----	June 1939.
Parry, A. and Kiralfy, A.: "Soviet Submarines in the Far East."	March 1937.
Peffer, N.: "America from Across the Pacific"-----	March 1937.
"America: the Jellyfish of the Pacific"-----	September 1935.
Perkins, B. W.: "The Failure of Civil Control in Occupied China."	June 1939.
Phinney, A.: "Racial Minorities in the Soviet Union"-----	September 1935.
Pollard, R. T.: (Letter to the Editor)-----	September 1937.
Porter, Catherine: "The Future of the Philippines"-----	June 1940.
Powell, I. B.: "The Commonwealth of the Philippines"-----	March 1936.
Price, E. B.: "The Manchurians and their New Deal"-----	June 1935.
Okazaki, S.: "Moscow, Yenan, Chungking"-----	March 1941.
Oudendyk, W. J.: "Is the Soviet Union's Position in the Far East only Defensive?"-----	March 1937.
Quigley, H. S.: "The Open Door and Neutrality"-----	September 1936.
Rager, F. A.: "Japanese Emigration and Japan's Population Pressure."	September 1941.
Rasmussen, A. H.: "The Wool Trade of North China"-----	March 1936.
Reid, J. G.: "The Fall of the Manchu Dynasty"-----	December 1936.
Robertson, C. J.: "The Rice Export from Burma, Siam and French Indo-China."	June 1936.
Roosevelt, N.: "Europe Lays Asia Open to Aggression"-----	December 1938.
Rosinger, L. K.: "Soviet Far Eastern Policy"-----	September 1940.
Rosinger, L. K.: "Politics and Strategy of China's Mobile War."	September 1939.
(Letter) "The Guerrilla War in China"-----	June 1939.
Rosinski, H.: "The Strategy of the Sino-Japanese Conflict"-----	March 1938.
Rothe, C.: "Tea Production and Tea Restriction"-----	December 1935.
"Restriction of Rubber Production in Netherlands-India."	March 1935.
Ronan, W.: "The Kra Canal"-----	September 1936.
Sarrant, A.: "The Indivisibility of Peace and the Inseparability of East and West."	December 1936.
Shaw, Glenn W.: "Contemporary Japanese Literature: A Foreigner's View."	September 1935.
Shepherd, Wm. R.: "The Teaching of Modern Oriental History in the West."	September 1935.
Shepherd, J.: "New Caledonia: Orphan of the South Pacific"-----	December 1940.

## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO "PACIFIC AFFAIRS" MARCH 1934 TO JUNE 1941—Con.

Schiller, A. A.: "Native Customary Law in the Netherlands East Indies."	June 1936.
Schrieke, B.: "American Negro and Colonial Native: Education and 'Equality'."	September 1937.
Schumpeter, E. B.: "The Problem of Sanctions in the Far East."	September 1939.
Schweitzer, L.: (Letter to Editor)	September 1937.
Sekiguchi, Y.: "The Changing Status of the Cabinet in Japan"	March 1938.
Sekine, G.: "America's Strategy Against Japan"	June 1941.
Shridharani, K.: "India in a Changing Asia"	March 1941.
Snow, E.: "Soviet Society in Northwest China"	September 1937.
Perry, A. and Kiralfy, A.: "Soviet Submarines in the Far East."	March 1937.
Kiralfy, A.: "The Armed Strength of the U. S. in the Pacific"	June 1938.
Soward, F. H.: "The Imperial Conference of 1937"	December 1937.
Spencer, J. E.: "Kueichow: An Internal Chinese Colony"	June 1940.
Stead, G.: (Letter)	March 1939.
Steiger, A. J.: "Stone Age Peoples in the"	June 1941.
Stein, Gunther: "Through the Eyes of a Japanese Newspaper Reader."	June 1936.
"China's Price Problem"	September 1941.
"Japanese State Finance"	December 1937.
"The Yen and the Sword"	March 1939.
Stevenson, T. A.: "Canadian Foreign Policy"	June 1934.
Steward, O.: "Air Communications and the Far East"	September 1935.
Strong, A. L.: "Eighth Route Region in North China"	June 1941.
Sun, J. C.: "New Trends in the Chinese Press"	March 1935.
Sutch, W. B.: "New Zealand's First Year of War"	March 1941.
Taiwan Jiho (Formosan Magazine): "Cultural Policy in Taiwan and the Problem of Kominka."	September 1941.
Takeyama, Y.: "A Japanese View of Thailand's Economic Independence."	December 1941.
Taylor, G. E.: "Reconstruction After Revolution: Kiangsi Province and the Chinese Nation."	September 1935.
"The Powers and the Unity of China"	December 1936.
"Mr. Taylor in Rebuttal"	June 1937.
"America's Pacific Policy: The Role and the Record."	December 1941.
Taylor, K. W.: "The Canadian-Japanese Tariff War"	December 1935.
Taylor, P. S.: "The San Francisco General Strike"	September 1934.
Taylor, W. H. and Brady, R. A.: "Policy Centralization in Japan Under the Koku-tai Principle."	March 1941.
Thurnwald, R. C.: "The Price of the White Man's Peace"	September 1936.
Timperley, H. J.: "Makers of Public Opinion about the Far East."	June 1936.
Thompson, V.: "The Landward Side of Singapore"	March 1941.
Thorp, J.: "Colonization Possibilities of Northwest China and Inner Mongolia."	December 1935.
Toynbee, A. J.: "The Next War—European Asia"	March 1934.
Utley, Freda: "Population and Conquest"	March 1937.
V., C. K.: "The Second Chinese National Financial Conference."	September 1934.
Vak, S. P., Jr.: "Third Conquest of the Philippines?"	September 1941.
Valk, M. H. van der: "The New Chinese Criminal Code"	March 1936.
Vandenbosch, A.: "Netherlands, India, and Japan"	September 1940.
Van der Valk, M. H.: "The Revolution in Chinese Legal Thought."	March 1938.
Van Kleck, M.: "The Moscow Trials"	June 1938.
Wales, N.: "Why the Chinese Communist Support the United Front—An Interview with Lo Fu."	September 1938.
"China's New Line of Industrial Defense"	September 1939.
Wang, Chi-chen: "Western Tides in Chinese Literature"	June 1934.

## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO "PACIFIC AFFAIRS" MARCH 1934 TO JUNE 1941—Con.

- Cang, Ching-chun: "Theodore Roosevelt and Japan's 'Monroe Doctrine'." March 1936.
- Wang, Yu-ch'uan: "The Rise of Land Tax and the Fall of Dynasties in Chinese History." June 1936.
- Wang, Hu-ch'uan: "The Development of Modern Social Science in China." September 1938.
- Wei, Meng-pu: "The Kuomintang in China: Its Fabric and Future." March 1940.
- Weinberg, A. K.: "Potentialities of America's Far Eastern Policy." June 1939.
- Wertheim, B.: "The Russo-Japanese Fisheries Controversy" June 1935.
- Wyte, Sir F.: "The Philippines as a Pawn in the Game" June 1934.
- "The Institute of Pacific Relations and the Crisis in the Far East." March 1936.
- "Footnote on 'American Foreign Policy'" March 1938.
- Winter, Ella: "What next in California?" March 1935.
- Williams, W. Wynne: "The Settlement of the Australian Tropics." June 1936.
- Wittfogel, K. A.: "No. III: A Large-Scale Investigation of China's Socio-Economic Structure." March 1938.
- Wolfers, A.: "Nationalist Policies and the Strategy of Peace" June 1934.
- Wootton, B.: "Some Implications of Anglo-Japanese Competition." December 1936.
- Wright, Q.: "The Legal Foundations of the Stimson Doctrine" December 1935.
- "A Pawn Approaches the Eighth Square" September 1934.
- Wu, I. T. K.: "American Capitalism and Imperialism" March 1935.
- Wye, C. K.: "Chinese Unification and Foreign Penetration" December 1935.
- Yakhontoff, V. A.: "Mongolia: Target or Screen" March 1936.
- Jamakawa, T.: "The Yosemite Conference and Japan" December 1936.
- Yanaga, C.: "Recent Trends in Japanese Political Thought" June 1940.
- Yanaijara, T.: "Problems of Japanese Administration in Korea." June 1938.
- Yokota, K.: "The Recent Development of the Stimson Doctrine." June 1935.
- Young, A. M.: "The Press and Japanese Thought" December 1937.
- (Letter) March 1939.

## EXHIBIT No. 85

## SIGNERS OF LETTERS FROM PEOPLE WHO KNOW OWEN LATTIMORE'S WORK

William R. Amberson, professor of physiology, University of Maryland  
 E. Cowles Andrus, professor of medicine, Johns Hopkins University  
 Donald Andrews, professor of physics, Johns Hopkins University  
 Hollis Bantier, professor, University of Chicago  
 Knight Biggerstaff, professor of Chinese history, Cornell University  
 Carrol Binder, journalist  
 Woodbridge Bingham, associate professor of Far Eastern history, University of California  
 Francis F. Beirne, author and columnist  
 Demaree Bess, staff writer, Saturday Evening Post  
 Eugene P. Boardman, assistant professor of history, University of Wisconsin  
 George Boas, professor of philosophy, Johns Hopkins University  
 Martin Toscan Bennett, consulting engineer  
 Derk Bolde, assistant professor of Chinese, University of Pennsylvania  
 Robert Blakely, editor, St. Louis  
 Dorothy Borg, research on Far East, New York city.  
 Hugh Borton, associate professor of Japanese, Columbia University  
 Adda Bozenan, professor of international relations, Sarah Lawrence College  
 Eleanor Breed, columnist  
 Norman Brown, director of South Asia Institute, University of Pennsylvania  
 Percy Buchanan, director, Institute of Asiatic Affairs, University of Oklahoma  
 Pearl Buck, author  
 Gladys W. Bundy, lawyer and Republican clubwoman

Robert E. Bundy, town clerk, Bethel, Vt.  
 Claude Buss, professor of history, Stanford University  
 Gertrude Bussey, professor, Goucher College  
 John F. Cady, associate professor of history, Ohio University  
 John C. Caldwell, ex-deputy director, United States Information Service for  
 Korea  
 Schuyler Camman, assistant professor, University of Pennsylvania  
 Wm. Mansfield Clark, professor of medicine, Johns Hopkins University  
 Zachariah Chafee, Jr., professor of law, Harvard University  
 Melvin Conant, China program, Harvard University  
 James J. Corry, Jr., lecturer in Chinese, University of Michigan  
 Robert S. Cochrane, director, Station WMAR, Baltimore  
 John Hadley Cox, assistant professor, University of Michigan  
 Lester Cowan, moving picture producer  
 Olive Thompson Cowell, professor of education, San Francisco State College  
 Francis Cleaves, assistant professor of Chinese, Harvard University  
 Spencer Coxe, American Friends Service (?)  
 Robert I. Crane, professor of history, University of Chicago  
 George B. Cressey, professor of geography, Syracuse University  
 Elmer Davis, radio commentator, American Broadcasting Co.  
 Lloyd E. Dewey, professor of finance, New York University  
 Josiah E. DuBois, Jr., lawyer  
 William Egerton, social sciences department, University of Chicago  
 Rupert Emerson, professor of government, Harvard University  
 Gertrude Ely, Bryn Mawr, Pa.  
 H. H. Fisher, chairman, Hoover Institute and Library, Stanford University  
 Grace Frank, professor of Latin, Johns Hopkins University.  
 Julian Friedman, London School of Economics  
 John K. Fairbank, professor of history, Harvard University  
 Miriam S. Farley, research associate, American Institute of Pacific Relations  
 Ludwig Freund, professor of political science, University of Chicago  
 Lewis Gannett, columnist, New York Herald Tribune  
 Charles S. Gardiner, research in Chinese History, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Gussie E. Gaskill, librarian, Cornell University  
 Meredith P. Gilpatrick, professor of political science, Ohio State University  
 Ann Gertler, assistant professor of Economics, Mount Holyoke College  
 Carrington Goodrich, professor of Chinese, Columbia University  
 Randall Gould, journalist  
 George Grassmuck, assistant professor of political science, Boston University  
 Mortimer Graves, secretary, American Council of Learned Societies  
 Louis Gottschalk, professor of history, University of Chicago  
 Morton Grodzins, professor of history, University of Chicago  
 Roger Hackett, China program, Howard University  
 J. W. Hall, instructor, University of Michigan  
 Ellen Hammer, Institute of International Studies, Yale University  
 Earl Parker Hanson, professor of geography, University of Delaware  
 G. W. Harrison, assistant professor, University of Florida  
 Richard Edes Harrison, cartographer  
 James R. Hightower, assistant professor of Chinese language and literature,  
 Harvard University  
 Everett Hawkins, professor of economics, Mount Holyoke College  
 Malcolm Hobbes, writer  
 W. L. Holland, secretary general, Institute of Pacific Relations  
 Paul Homan, professor of economics, U. S. L. A.  
 Richard Hooker, professor of social sciences, University of Chicago  
 Bruce C. Hooper, professor of government, Harvard University  
 Elizabeth Huff, head, East Asiatic Library, University of Chicago  
 Nobutake Ike, curator, Japanese Collection, Hoover Institute and Library,  
 Stanford  
 Gerald W. Johnson, author  
 David R. Jones, president, Bennet College  
 Arthur Jorgenson, former missionary in Japan  
 George McT. Kahin, assistant professor of political science, Johns Hopkins  
 University  
 George A. Kennedy, associate professor of Chinese, Yale University  
 V. O. Key, professor of political economy, Yale University

Norman Kiell, department of sociology and philosophy foundations, Teachers College, Columbia University  
 Robin Kinkead, journalist, formerly OWI, San Francisco  
 Gerard P. Koh, associate professor of Chinese, Yale University  
 Yongjeung Kim, head of Korean Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.  
 Benjamin H. Kizer, lawyer, formerly UNNRA Director for China  
 Hyman Kublin, assistant professor of history, Brooklyn College  
 Lawrence Krader, Far Eastern Institute, University of Washington  
 John D. Larkin, professor of political science and dean of University of Chicago  
 Alexander Laing, librarian, Dartmouth College  
 Jacob Landau, Overseas News Agency  
 Frederic C. Lane, professor of history, Johns Hopkins University  
 Carl T. Keller, Harvard-Yenching Institute  
 Willis J. King, Bishop of the Methodist Church  
 Marlon J. Levy, Jr., assistant professor of sociology, Princeton University  
 Wayner Leys, professor, University of Chicago  
 Frederica de Laguna, professor of anthropology, Bryn Mawr College  
 Richard Lanterbach, author  
 Clare Leighton, author and artist  
 Paul Linebarger, professor of Asiatic Political School of Advanced International Studies  
 William Lockwood, department director, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton  
 Helen Lynd, professor of social sciences, Sarah Lawrence College  
 Clarence Long, professor of political economy, Johns Hopkins University  
 Donald McKay, professor of history, chairman of committee on international studies, Harvard University  
 Shannon McCune, chairman, department of geography, Colgate University  
 Desmond Martin, research student and author  
 Maury Maverick, former Congressman and mayor of San Antonio  
 William Mayer, former military attaché, Peking  
 Franz Michael, professor of far-eastern history, University of Washington  
 Broadus Mitchell, professor of economics, Rutgers University  
 Hans Morgenthau, professor of political science, University of Chicago  
 Saul Padover, dean of School of Politics, New School for Social Research  
 E. F. Peurose, professor of geography, Johns Hopkins University  
 Arthur Upham Pope, director, Asia Institute  
 John A. Pope, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington  
 Edwards A. Park, professor of pediatrics, Johns Hopkins University  
 Lucius C. Porter, ex-professor, Yenching University, Peking  
 Earl H. Pritchard, associate professor of far-eastern history, University of Chicago  
 Dale Pontius, Roosevelt College, Chicago  
 Rollin B. Posey, professor of political science, Northwestern University  
 Hortense Powdermaker, professor of anthropology, Queens College  
 Earl Pritchard, associate professor of far-eastern history, University of Chicago  
 Hermann Pritchett, professor  
 Nathaniel Peffer, professor of international relations, Columbia University  
 Harold S. Quigley, professor of political science, University of Minnesota  
 Wilnot Ragsdale, foreign correspondent, Time and Life  
 Christopher Rand, foreign correspondent  
 C. F. Remer, professor of economics, University of Michigan  
 Lloyd Reynolds, professor of economics, Yale University  
 Charles J. Rhoads, former Governor, Federal Reserve Bank, Philadelphia  
 Millard Rogers, assistant professor of Chinese art history, Stanford University  
 Lawrence K. Rosinger, research associate, American Institute of Pacific Relations  
 Doris Russel, professor of English, Vassar College  
 Easton Rothwell, vice chairman, Hoover Institute and Library, Stanford, University  
 Stanley Salmen, executive vice president and director, Little, Brown & Co.  
 Lawrence Stickman, vice director, Nelson Gallery, Kansas City  
 Dorothy Shields, professor of political economy, Goucher College  
 Father Louis Schram, Immaculate Heart Missions  
 Harvey Schuman, publisher  
 Elbridge Sibley, Social Science Research Council  
 Charles Siepmann, professor of education, New York University  
 Ernest J. Simmons, professor of Slavic languages, Columbia University



Harlow Shapley, professor of astronomy, Harvard University  
 Robert E. Sherwood, author and playwright  
 Stanley Spector, Far Eastern Institute, University of Washington  
 Vilhjálmur Stefánsson, Arctic explorer and author  
 David Stevens, former director, division of humanities, Rockefeller Foundation  
 Edgar Snow, editorial writer, Saturday Evening Post  
 Rodger Swearingen, lecturer, University of Southern California  
 Leland Stowe, editor, the Reporter  
 Earl Swisher, history department, University of Colorado  
 Bradford Smith, author  
 Thomas Smith, assistant professor of far-eastern history, Stanford University  
 Herbert Bayard Swope, editor  
 Phillip H. Taylor, professor of international relations, Syracuse University  
 S. B. Thomas, Institute of Pacific Relations, New York  
 Virginia Thompson, far-eastern research, New York  
 Daniel Thorner, assistant professor of economic history, University of Pennsylvania  
 Elliott R. Thorpe, brigadier general, United States Army, retired  
 Nischa Tittleve, associate professor of anthropology, University of Michigan  
 Alfred Tozzer, professor of anthropology (retired), Harvard University  
 Andrew G. Truzal, president, Hood College  
 Harold Vinacke, professor of political science, University of Cincinnati  
 James P. Warburg, banker and author  
 Royal J. Wald, research fellow, California  
 Langdon Warner, curator of oriental department, Fogg Museum, Harvard University  
 Richard J. Walsh, president, John Day Co.  
 William Stix Wasserman, chairman, Electronized Chemicals Corps.  
 George H. Watson, University of Chicago  
 Edward A. Weeks, editor of the Atlantic Monthly  
 George Wilson, social science department, University of Chicago  
 Thomas Wiener, department of Slavic studies, Duke University  
 Harold J. Wiens, assistant professor of geography, Yale University  
 Herbert F. West, professor of English, Dartmouth College  
 C. Martin Wilbur, associate professor of Chinese, Columbia University  
 John B. Whitelaw, professor of education, Johns Hopkins University  
 Arthur Wright, assistant professor of history, Stanford University  
 Mary Wright, curator of Chinese Collection, Hoover Institute and Library, Stanford University  
 Quincy Wright, professor of international law, University of Chicago  
 J. B. Whitehead, professor of electrical engineering, Johns Hopkins University  
 H. R. Wishengrad, Overseas News Agency  
 H. G. W. Woodward, professor of history, Johns Hopkins University  
 Joseph K. Yamigawa, associate professor of Japanese, University of Michigan  
 Margaret Young, formerly secretary of Page School of International Relations

## EXHIBIT No. 86

## MINUTES OF FIGHTING-FUNDS FOR FINLAND, INC., 1940

The first meeting of the Maryland Committee for Fighting-Funds for Finland, Inc., met on Tuesday afternoon, February 20, 5 p. m., at 516 North Charles Street. Those present were Mr. Baldwin, Judge Leser, Dr. Lovejoy, Mr. Theodore Marburg, Mr. Charles Marburg, Miss Poe, Mr. Porter, and Miss Snow. Mr. Charles Marburg in the chair.

The names of those who had consented to serve on the committee were announced as follows: Dr. Harold N. Arrowsmith, Mr. Rignal W. Baldwin, Mr. George G. Carey, Jr., Mrs. Rufus Gibbs, Dr. W. Stull Holt, Mr. Wallace Lanahan, Dr. Owen Lattimore, Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron, Judge Oscar Leser, Dr. Arthur O. Lovejoy, Dr. Kemp Malone, Mr. Charles L. Marburg, Mr. Theodore Marburg, Mr. F. Furnival Peard, Miss Mary Lee Poe, Mr. Alexander G. Porter, Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord, Dr. F. C. Reynolds, and Miss Jessie L. Snow.

Mr. Charles Marburg announced that Maj. Gen. John F. O'Ryan had accepted the chairmanship of the National Organization with headquarters at 120 Broadway, New York City. Quoting from a telegram from Mr. R. F. Seton-Harris,

executive secretary of the national organization, "Fighting-Funds for Finland, Inc., is now actively forming in each State. Its charter calls for monies and other donations to be outright gifts to the Republic of Finland without restriction for the purchase of armaments and other munitions in defense of Finland \* \* \* all organizing expenses are to be privately underwritten as far as possible, so that funds will go in toto to the Finns." Mr. Seton-Harris also emphasized the importance of speeding up organization plans in order that action could start at once to rush collections to the courageous Finnish people.

Mr. Theodore Marburg presented a statement for the press. A copy is attached to these minutes. A letter written by Mr. Marburg which was to appear in the *Morning Sun* the following day was also read.

Mr. Charles Marburg announced that Mr. F. Furnival Peard, of the Maryland Trust Co., had consented to receive contributions for Fighting-Funds for Finland, Inc., in Maryland.

The motion was made by Mr. Porter and seconded by Miss Poe that Miss Snow be appointed the executive secretary of the Maryland Committee for Fighting-Funds for Finland, Inc. The meeting adjourned to be reconvened the following day, February 21, at 4:30 p. m.

Respectfully submitted.

JESSIE L. SNOW, *Executive Secretary.*

EXHIBIT No. 87

QUOTATIONS FROM OWEN LATTIMORE'S WRITINGS

"The spread of direct Russian control over Asia would be disastrous for the countries of Asia as well as for America and Europe." ("The Situation in Asia," by Owen Lattimore (Little, Brown & Co., 1949). Page 12.)

"No Chinese government can be genuinely independent if it is subject to manipulation by Russia." (Statement signed by Mr. Lattimore together with Senator Flinders, Senator Murray, and Professors Dulles, Fisher and MacNair, December 30, 1946.)

"At the same time, any new departure in United States policy in Asia must be proof against the accusation of 'appeasing' Communism as a doctrine or Russia as a state." (Article in "The Atlantic Monthly," January 1950, by Owen Lattimore.)

"Those of us who have never been Marxists have many straightforward disagreements with the Marxists." (Book Review in the "New York Herald Tribune" by Owen Lattimore, November 30, 1947.)

"United States policy should aim to increase the ability of countries in Asia to do without Russia, by encouraging a steady improvement of the three-way economic relationship between Asia, Europe, and America, including the resumption of the supply of raw materials from Asia, the sale of Europe's manufactures in Asia, and American financing both of industrialization in Asia and recovery in Europe. The American financing should be undertaken as a sound enterprise in increasing production and consumption; not as a doling out of subsidies to keep the economies of Asia and Europe stagnantly alive." (Article in "The Atlantic Monthly," January 1950, by Owen Lattimore.)

\* \* \* American policy, to be successful, must operate through the United Nations as much as possible and strengthen the United Nations as much as possible. A two-world system of American allies and satellites, ranged against Russian allies and satellites, is not enough in America's favor and may be too much in Russia's favor. Only by working through the United Nations can the third countries, which are already critically important in Asia and may become important in Europe, be brought closer to the American side than to the Russian side." ("The Situation in Asia" by Owen Lattimore (Little, Brown & Co., 1949) Page 227.)

"The fact is that the American interest, of course and without further discussion, lies in making sure of the minimum expansion of Russian control and influence." (Lecture by Owen Lattimore, Mt. Holyoke College, June 1948.)

"Nationalism is the only bedrock on which a political structure can be built in China—or anywhere in Asia—today. If we are as quick as the Russians and the Communists of Asia are to build on that bedrock, then the new political structures that are being built in China and all over Asia will incorporate many features of capitalism, private enterprise, and political democracy in their third

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION 1855

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 8, 1950.

The Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

My DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I am sending you herewith some material which I hope will be of use to the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relation Committee in examining the charges which Senator McCarthy has made against my wife. The enclosures include:

1. A statement which I have written about myself;
2. A file of testimonial letters, most of which were written at my request, together with a copy of my request for the letters; and
3. A copy of the statement about me which was released by the Navy Department on March 13, 1950.

Respectfully yours,

STEPHEN BRUNAUER.

Enclosures.

AFFIDAVIT OF STEPHEN BRUNAUER

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO WIT:

On this 11th day of May, 1950, before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public in and for the District aforesaid, personally appeared Stephen Braunauer, signed the attached declaration in my presence, and made oath in due form of law that said attached declaration is a true statement of the matters and facts set forth therein.

He has also initialed each page of said attached eight-paged declaration in my presence.

Subscribed and sworn to before me.

HERBERT A. ENGLER, Notary Public.

[SEAL]

My commission expires January 1, 1951.

I, Stephen Brunauer, residing at 3417 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C., make the following declaration because of certain statements and insinuations made by Senator Joseph McCarthy on March 13 and because of questions asked by Senator Bourke Hickenlooper on March 27 before the Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This subcommittee was appointed under Senate Resolution 231 to investigate charges of disloyalty in the Department of State.

I am employed by the Department of the Navy as Chief Technical Administrator of Explosives Research and Development, Bureau of Ordnance. I have never been employed by the Department of State. My wife is a State Department employee, and in a previous appearance before the subcommittee has already dealt more than adequately with the statements and insinuations made about her. Since insinuations about me were used against my wife, I wish to show that they, too, are without basis in fact.

In support and corroboration of my declaration, I am attaching a file of testimonial letters, most of which I requested from the writers as a means of furnishing the subcommittee with detailed information about my work, character, loyalty and integrity.

I am a loyal American. I came to the United States from Hungary in 1921, at the age of 18, because I wanted to make my life in this country, which I considered the land of hope and freedom. I became a citizen on September 1, 1927. In 1942 I became an officer in the United States Naval Reserve and entered upon active duty on October 23 of that year, serving until November 13, 1946. I sought military service, although I could have continued my work as a civilian scientist throughout the war period, because I felt that I must participate wholeheartedly in the defense of the United States. I have remained in the Department of the Navy as a civilian employee because I believe that I have a contribution to make to the national defense through the development of more effective explosives. I am still a Reserve officer. I belong to Volunteer Ordnance Component W-1 of Washington, and attend its meetings regularly. At an appropriate place in this declaration I shall describe more fully some of the contributions which I have made and am now making to the national defense. The members of my immediate family are all in the United States. My mother has made her home with me in Washington since 1936; my brother and his wife arrived in this country on

December 27, 1948, as political exiles from Communist-dominated Hungary; my wife and children are native Americans.

I am not a Communist. I am not a Communist sympathizer. On the contrary, I am bitterly opposed to communism. At one time in my life, more than 20 years ago, I was a member of the Hungarian Section of the Young Workers League in New York City, for a period of about 3 years, from 1923 or early 1924, to the end of 1926 or early 1927. Since dropping out of this organization I have not belonged to any organization listed as subversive by the Attorney General nor to any organization cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In this declaration I am describing more fully certain aspects of my life and work which seem to me especially significant in refuting charges that I may be disloyal or a security risk.

First, I wish to summarize the evolution of my political opinions since coming to the United States.

From my arrival in New York in October 1921 until I moved to Washington in February 1928 I was occupied mainly in obtaining an education. I had graduated from high school in Budapest with the highest honors. In New York I studied at City College and at Columbia University and supported myself, and even sent money back to Hungary to help in the education of my younger brother. When I arrived in America I spoke no English. I was a lonely young man, and had few opportunities for personal contacts with native Americans. In the midst of my work and study it was not easy for me to gain an intimate and first-hand understanding of the culture and institutions of my new homeland. One illustration of the slowness with which a newcomer learns American customs was the fact that when, in June 1925, a few days before graduation from Columbia, I was notified that I had been elected to Phi Beta Kappa, I had no idea what this meant. I had to go to the University Library to look up the meaning of Phi Beta Kappa.

At the age of 20, I had spent two years in New York in new surroundings working and studying intensively, and I was starved for companionship. When I was sought out and befriended by some Hungarian Communists, my ignorance of the American way and my loneliness helped them to persuade me to join their group, the Hungarian Section of the Young Workers League. Social activities—dances, singing, and sports, especially soccer, which I had played as a boy in Hungary—occupied most of our time, and I was able to have some of the fun I had missed so badly during my first two years in America.

Thus, although the Young Workers League was an adjunct of the Workers Party (the forerunner of the present Communist Party), it was some time before I became critical of their ideas. The leaders of the League got me to write a few articles in the Hungarian Communist newspaper and to give some talks to Hungarians in New York and neighboring towns. I believe that I wrote five or six articles and I delivered a number of lectures. By this time I remember very few details of that period, because long ago I put my experience in the Young Workers League behind me and forgot it almost completely until 1947, when I discovered that this episode of my past had become an issue in connection with my security record.

Since Senator Hickenlooper asked a question of my wife about her belonging to the Young Workers League, I should like to state here that this question is probably based on mistaken identity. In 1926 I married Anna Friedmann, a Hungarian girl, in New York. She was a member of the Young Workers League and in fact she had been instrumental in bringing me into that organization. Her brother, about whom Senator Hickenlooper also inquired, also belonged to the Young Workers League. I understand that he is an active Communist, but I should like to state that I have not seen him for twenty-two years. My first wife and I were separated in 1928, and we were divorced in 1931. I married Esther Caukin, my present wife, in 1931.

In 1924 the Workers Party was in turmoil over the American Presidential election, the issue being whether to have their own candidate or to support La Follette. The Young Workers took part in the debate, though they were not permitted to vote at the Workers Party meetings. I wrote two articles for "Uj Előe" supporting the minority view, which was that La Follette should be supported. The majority, led by William Z. Foster, intended to run a Workers' Party candidate but, as we were given to understand, its decision was overruled by Moscow. Even though the side I had supported won, I felt disillusioned because I believe in majority rule. Also, I did not like the idea of Moscow directing the American Communists. As the months went by I found more and more to criticize in the ideas and methods of the Communists. At the end of 1926 or

possibly early in 1927 I dropped out of the Young Workers League. I did not write a letter of resignation, but told them I was leaving, and stopped paying dues and attending meetings.

From 1927 to 1933 I went through a period of transition from Communist ideology to liberalism. In that period I still had some radical tendencies, but they played a very unimportant part in my life as compared with my scientific work and professional advancement. One of the instances I can recall of my increasingly critical attitude toward communism is that when I was at Johns Hopkins in 1931-32, I gave a talk to a group of students on Science in the Soviet Union. In it I condemned the Soviet attitude toward science, especially condemning Science at the Crossroads, a Russian book which had just been translated and published in New York.

The complete break came in 1933, when I spent almost a year in Germany doing postgraduate study. I was on leave of absence from the Department of Agriculture. My wife and I were vigorously opposed to the Nazi regime and when we observed the Communist tactics, which at times opposed the Nazis and at times supported them, I decided that I could no longer approve of any Communist ideas or methods but must oppose communism completely and actively. In common with many other Americans in the early 1930's I thought for a time that the Communist system might be all right for Russia, but as more information came out of the Soviet Union I came to the conclusion that this view was incorrect, also, and that communism was not working even there.

In her testimony before the subcommittee my wife explained how she came to substitute for me as a speaker before the Washington Chapter of the American Friends of the Soviet Union in 1934. I corroborate her statement and add that except for this event and except for attending the two meetings of the organization at which my wife presided, I had no relations with the organization.

I wish to quote here a passage from the testimonial letter of Dr. George Gamow, Professor of Physics at the George Washington University, who escaped from Soviet Russia and came to this country in 1934; and who has known me ever since his arrival in Washington:

"I can assure you that, as a man who came from Soviet Russia, I have a very good nose to scent communistic sympathies, and I am certain that neither Stephen nor his wife, Esther, fall into that category. As a matter of fact, Stephen told me many years ago that in his youth he was interested in that kind of ideas, but realized very soon that they lead to perish rather than to the benefit of humanity."

I repeat here that since 1927 I have not belonged to any organization which has been listed as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States or by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I am a member of the American Chemical Society, the Washington Academy of Sciences, the Philosophical Society of Washington, Sigma Xi, and Phi Beta Kappa. From 1928 until 1930 or 1931 I belonged to the International Friendship Club sponsored by the Friends Meeting at 1811 Eye Street NW., in Washington. This was a local social club whose membership represented all political views as well as several nationalities and races. Since 1943 I have belonged to the Parent-Teachers Association of the Phoebe Hearst Elementary School, the school which my two daughters attend. This is the extent of my participation in organizations.

In addition to the foregoing description of my political evolution, I wish to answer the three questions which Senator McCarthy raised in his statement before the subcommittee on March 13, and then comment on his assertions regarding the views of various investigative agencies about me.

As to the questions:

(1) Have I been the subject of a constant investigation by Government agencies over a period of ten years? The answer is probably "Yes." I know I have been investigated several times, and the explanation is simple. I have held a number of different posts during the past ten years, for each of which an investigation was required. Early in 1941, while I was still in the Department of Agriculture, I was asked to become a consultant to the National Defense Research Committee, and was investigated. I was investigated again in 1942 before being commissioned an officer in the Naval Reserve. In 1945 I was cleared to the Manhattan District, but do not know whether a special investigation preceded the clearance. I was investigated again under the President's Loyalty Program as a civilian employee of the Navy Department. The result of all these investigations was stated in the announcement given out by the Navy on March 13 that I had been thoroughly

investigated and was not charged with disloyalty. Among my testimonial letters there are many written by Naval officers who have worked with me and observed me closely. I quote here a paragraph from the letter of Vice Admiral G. F. Hussey, Jr., USN (Ret.) who was formerly Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department:

"On at least one occasion Commander Brunauer's loyalty was questioned. There were made available to me, as I recall it, all data in the possession of the Office of Naval Intelligence and, I believe, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerning Commander Brunauer. After considering these data, together with my own observations of him, and after discussing the situation with my Deputy Chief, I was satisfied in my own mind that Commander Brunauer's loyalty was above reproach. On that basis I continued him in his responsible position involving classified work and subsequent to the war approved of his being placed in a civil status to do similar work. I am not certain whether his transfer to a civil status was finally accomplished before my detachment from the Bureau in September 1947 or after it, but the step in any event had my approval."

(2) Was I a close friend and collaborator of Noel Field, "known Communist who recently and mysteriously disappeared behind the Iron Curtain"? The answer is "No." I was never a close friend of Mr. Field, although I knew him from 1928 through the early thirties. At that time he appeared to be a liberal in politics. In 1934 after I returned from Germany I met him at a social gathering and learned that he had become a radical in his views. He did not say that he had become a Communist, and I had no further knowledge of his political views until they were referred to in the press during the past year. The last time I saw Noel Field was at the end of 1945 or early 1946 during the visit that he and his wife made in Washington after the war. About 30 or 40 of their former friends and acquaintances gathered to hear about the relief work they had done in France and Switzerland during the war. There was no discussion of politics, and I exchanged only a few words with Noel Field during the entire evening. To the best of my recollection, that is the only time I have seen him since he went to Geneva to work for the League of Nations in 1935 or 1936. As to the term "collaborator," I have never collaborated with Noel Field on anything.

(3) Have I admitted to associates that I was a member of the Communist Party? I can answer this question by referring to the information contained in the testimonial letters. I have told some of my friends of my early connection with the Young Workers League. I described my relationship with the Communist movement to the Loyalty and Security Board of the Department of State when I appeared as a witness for my wife, on July 28, 1948; and I described it to the Navy after I became aware that my early Communist connections caused some questions as to my present loyalty.

However, until Senator McCarthy mentioned the findings of the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1947 and "a Senate Investigating Committee in 1941" I did not know that my political views had been the subject of congressional investigations. If I had known this, I would have sought to clarify my political views and would have taken whatever steps were possible to clear my record.

The account of my political development and the answers to Senator McCarthy's allegations should be looked at against the background of my scientific work and my efforts for the national defense which, together, have occupied by far the largest part of my time, energy, and thought for the last twenty-two years.

From 1928 to 1942 I did scientific work in the Department of Agriculture, concentrating upon fundamental research in physical chemistry. During the first five years most of my spare time was devoted to graduate study, and I obtained the M. S. degree at George Washington University in 1929 and the Ph. D. degree at Johns Hopkins University in 1933. In this period of 14½ years I made some scientific contributions and some practical contributions. The latter related to the production of artificial fertilizers; the former to the processes of catalysis and adsorption which are of fundamental scientific importance and which also play an important part in industry. I published about twenty scientific articles, several of which received considerable acclaim in scientific circles. I also wrote a book called Adsorption of Gases and Vapors, which was published by the Princeton University Press in 1943 and the Oxford University Press in 1944. For my scientific contributions in the Department of

Agriculture the Chemical Society of Washington awarded me the Hillebrand Prize for 1945.

From October 1942 to August 1946 I was an officer in the Naval Reserve on active duty. I started as a Lieutenant and was assigned to the Research and Development Division of the Bureau of Ordnance. At that time Lieutenant (j. g.) W. E. Land and I were responsible for the work on explosives. Together we built up explosives research and development until, by the end of the war there were close to fifty men, officers and civilians, engaged in this work under my supervision. In addition, hundreds of men were collaborating with us in the National Defense Research Committee and within the services on the development of explosives. This work led to the development of new explosives which I recommended for adoption by the Navy, and the Navy accepted my recommendations. These new important explosives included one, which has been adopted for all underwater weapons of the Navy; another, which has been adopted for the antiaircraft weapons of the Navy; and a third one, which has been adopted as a filler of bombs by the Army. A considerable number of the testimonial letters attached to this statement deal with my contributions during the war. I quote here two paragraphs from one of these letters, which I received from E. Brigh Wilson, Jr., Professor of Chemistry at Harvard University, who is Visiting Professor at Oxford University this year. Professor Wilson, whom I have known well since 1942, is recognized as one of the most brilliant scientists in the United States and is considered by those who are associated with him as an American of unquestionable loyalty and highest integrity. Immediately upon reading about Senator McCarthy's charges on March 17, in Oxford, he wrote to me:

"Knowing your wartime work as I do I can say that there was no more devoted, self-sacrificing, and sincere patriot in all Washington than you. The job you did was magnificent and deserves the undying gratitude of all Americans and not a treatment like this.

"Your mobilization of scientific assistance for the solution of problems connected with explosives was a highlight of my acquaintance with the services."

For my contributions to the Navy during the war I was awarded the Commendation Ribbon by the Secretary of the Navy and was decorated by the British Government with the Order of the British Empire.

Since September 9, 1946, I have held my present position in the Department of the Navy. When I joined the Navy in 1942 I expected to return to scientific research after the war. However, the Navy wanted me to stay as a civilian scientist, and I stayed because I thought I could make some useful contributions to the national security.

Before discussing my main work for the Navy since the war, I wish to mention my activities in Hungary in 1946, where I was on temporary duty on technical intelligence work. From May 10 to August 10 of that year I was assigned to the United States Naval Representative in the Allied Control Commission for Hungary. I believe I was able to make a unique contribution because of being a scientist and a Naval officer and also a native of Hungary. The attached testimonial letters in Group II give a fairly detailed account of those activities in which I engaged that were not highly classified. These letters show especially what impression I made on people who were very sensitive to political attitudes.

I quote here a brief description of part of my work in Hungary contained in the letter from Rear Admiral W. F. Dietrich, USN (Ret), who was my commanding officer at that time:

"In the years 1945-46, I was US Naval Member of the Allied Control Commission for Hungary, with headquarters at Budapest. During 1946, from about the latter part of May until early August, Commander Stephen Brunauer, then permanently attached to the Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department—in which position he remained on in civil status—came to Budapest and served temporarily under me for a little more than two months. At this time the Office of Research and Inventions, Navy Department, was fostering a technical survey into developments during the past war in former enemy countries and the outstanding scientists in the various fields. Brunauer, born in Hungary, and had received his basic education there, knew not only the language but also had former colleagues of his youth in university, some of whom were well acquainted in the scientific advancements. Thus, Brunauer was particularly valuable in connection

with taking the survey in Hungary, and in writing up the leading Hungarian Scientists, giving a biographical outline of their accomplishments, political behavior past and present, etc. As a result of this work, which had to be cleverly and expertly handled, so as not to arouse Soviet and Hungarian Communist opposition, several of these scientists are now in this country. Others, seeing that the West was interested in their welfare, also escaped the Iron Curtain and are today in Britain, France, Sweden, and Switzerland, even South America. Still others, encumbered by large families or parents well in years, stayed back, but are either now in Russia or living in constant fear that they will be transported there as research workers."

Most of the scientists referred to by Admiral Dietrich who are now in this country as a result of my activities came to the George Washington University to begin with; some stayed there and others went to such places as Johns Hopkins University, National Fireworks, Inc., etc. They are doing outstanding work and some of them are already making significant contributions to aspects of science which are today of great importance to America.

My main work since the war has been to maintain and build up on a peacetime basis the explosives research and development program of the Navy. There have been three phases of this work, the preparations for the testing of the atomic bomb against ships; the consolidation and reorganization of research on explosives, and the continuance of the development of explosives.

The Bureau of Ordnance participated actively in the Bikini tests in 1946, its main job being to prepare and apply the instruments for measuring the effects of the atomic explosions at Bikini. I was appointed by Admiral Hussey, who was then Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, as Officer in Charge of this work.

At about this time, the first legislation on the control of atomic energy was being considered by a special committee of the Senate. Senator Ball and I discussed this problem many evenings. When he drafted a bill on the subject I helped him. In February 1946 I was called before the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy to testify on the pending legislation. In my testimony I touched briefly on several points but I went into detail on only one point, which was closest to my heart and to my personal interests. I urged that the military should not be excluded from the control of atomic energy, since they have a vital interest in its use.

Parallel with my activities when I was head of the Bureau of Ordnance Instrumentation Group for the Bikini tests, and more intensively later, I worked on building up an adequate postwar research organization in the field of explosives for the Navy. I feel that I was instrumental in persuading a considerable number of the leading scientists in this field to come to the Navy or to continue their work for the Navy and the other services, and as a result the Navy and the National Military Establishment now have an adequate organization to carry on explosives research and development during peacetime.

While I cannot reveal the nature of my contributions to the field of explosives since the war, I can state that they are considered to be of major significance by those who are familiar with my work.

The foregoing account of my scientific work and military service is offered as positive evidence of my loyalty to America and my trustworthiness as an official of the United States Government. I hope that I have described my beliefs and my activities fully enough and that no doubt is left in anyone's mind about my loyalty and my security status.

STEPHEN BRUNAUER.

[Enclosure 2]

DEAR —: Please forgive me for writing a form letter to you. I am sending out close to a hundred of these letters, and it would be impossible to do it if I wrote a separate letter to each of you.

You doubtless read the charges Senator McCarthy made against my wife and me on the thirteenth of March. You doubtless have your own opinion on the subject. I do not know how good the press service is where you are at present, so I enclose here a copy of the official Navy press release about me. The Department of State made a similar statement about my wife.

I expect to be called before the Senate sometime next week to clear myself of Senator McCarthy's charges. (No definite date has been fixed as yet.) I should like to enlist your help in clearing myself.



Would you be willing to write a letter about me to Senator Tydings? The way I visualize it, the letter should contain the following information:

- (1) a brief statement of who you are and what sort of work you are engaged in at present;
- (2) how long you have known me; what sort of connections we had with each other;
- (3) what you think of my character, my loyalty, my reliability, and my contributions; and
- (4) anything else you wish to state.

The letter should be addressed to the Honorable Millard Tydings, United States Senate, Washington, D. C. However, I would appreciate it if you would mail it to me, together with a copy for myself. I would not like to swamp Senator Tydings with individual letters arriving at separate times. It would look like an attempt to exert pressure on him. What I should like to do is to collect all letters and hand them over to Senator Tydings at the time of my appearance before the Subcommittee.

I would deeply appreciate it if you would act urgently on this matter. However, even if your letter does not arrive prior to the hearings, I can still collect the late letters, and transmit them to the Subcommittee later.

With grateful thanks for your help, and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN BRUNAUER,

3417 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.

MARCH 17, 1950.

#### LIST OF TESTIMONIAL LETTERS

In order to facilitate the work of the investigation, I have arranged the 104 letters I received to date (May 8, 1950) into three groups. In Group I have been placed the 30 letters that I consider the most important for my case. In Group II I collected the 13 letters that have bearing on my activities in Hungary in 1946, and the consequences thereof. Group III contains the rest of the letters.

1. Senator Joseph Ball, Washington, D. C.
2. Vice Admiral G. F. Hussey, Jr., U. S. N. (Ret.), Formerly Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance
3. Dr. E. Bright Wilson, Professor of Chemistry, Harvard University
4. Dr. R. E. Gibson, Director, Applied Physics Laboratory, Johns Hopkins University
5. Dr. L. R. Hafstad, Director of Reactor Development, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
6. Dr. John Von Neumann, Professor of Mathematics, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.
7. G. F. Strollo, Ordnance Engineer, Explosives Res. and Dev., Bureau of Ordnance
8. Dr. G. B. Kistiakowsky, Professor of Chemistry, Head of Department, Harvard University
9. Dr. S. B. Hendricks, Head Chemist, Plant Industry Station, Beltsville, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture
10. Dr. George Gamow, Professor of Physics, George Washington University
11. Dr. G. K. Hartmann, Chief, Explosives Department, Naval Ordnance Laboratory
12. Dr. P. M. Fye, Associate Chief, Explosives Department, Naval Ordnance Laboratory
13. Dr. R. J. Seeger, Chief, Aeroballistics Department, Naval Ordnance Laboratory
14. Dr. F. J. Weyl, Acting Chief, Division of Mathematical Sciences, Office of Naval Research
15. Dr. Edward Teller, Professor of Physics, University of Chicago
16. Mr. S. J. Porter, Director of Research and Development, National Fireworks, Inc.
17. Rear Admiral M. F. Schoeffel, U. S. N., Commander, Carrier Division six, U. S. Atlantic Fleet.
18. Rear Admiral F. I. Entwistle, U. S. N., Deputy Commander, Western Sea Frontier
19. Dr. D. P. MacDougall, Division Chief, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory

20. Dr. B. D. Van Evera, Professor of Chemistry, Coordinator of Scientific Activities, George Washington University
21. Dr. F. G. Brickwedde, Chief, Heat and Power Division, National Bureau of Standards
22. R. W. Hummer, Chemist, Dow Chemical Company
23. Rear Admiral K. H. Noble, U. S. N. (Ret.), Formerly Assistant Chief of Bureau of Ordnance for Research
24. Professor Theodore Von Karman, Formerly Chairman of Scientific Advisory Board, U. S. Air Force
25. Dr. Richard Courant, Professor of Mathematics, Head of Department, New York University
26. Mr. Norman MacLeod, Research Director, Old and Barnes, Inc.
27. Captain S. H. Crittenden, Jr., U. S. N., U. S. Pacific Fleet.
28. Dr. W. E. Land, Deputy Section Head, Explosives Res. and Dev., Bureau of Ordnance
29. Captain J. H. Sides, U. S. N., Office of the Chief of Naval Operations
30. W. Edwards Deming, Adviser in Sampling, Bureau of the Census

## GROUP II

31. Mr. Ferenc Nagy, Herndon, Virginia, Formerly Prime Minister of Hungary
32. Dr. Aladar Szegedy-Maszak, Washington, D. C., Formerly Minister of Hungary to the United States
33. Rear Admiral W. F. Dietrich, U. S. N. (Ret.), Washington, D. C., Formerly U. S. Naval Representative, Allied Control Commission for Hungary
34. Dr. Alexander Szasz, Bank of America, San Francisco, California, Formerly Counselor of Hungarian Legation, Washington, D. C.
35. Dr. Zoltan Bay, George Washington University, Formerly Professor of Physics, Technical University of Budapest
36. Dr. Sandor A. Hoffmann, National Fireworks, Inc., Formerly Associate Professor of Chemistry, Technical University of Budapest
37. Dr. Leslie Kovaszny, Associate Professor, Johns Hopkins University, Formerly Associate Professor of Aerodynamics, Technical University of Budapest
38. Dr. John Farago, George Washington University, Formerly Assistant Director in Charge of Research, Chemical Institute of Budapest
39. Mr. Charles Pulvari, George Washington University, Formerly owner of the firm Charles Pulvari, Inc., Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, Budapest, Hungary
40. Dr. Laszlo Jekely, Forest Hills, New York, Formerly Minister in Charge of the Cabinet Office of the President of Hungary
41. Miss Agl Jambor, Philadelphia, Pa., Concert Pianist
42. Dr. George Papp, George Washington University, Formerly Associate Professor of Physics, Technical University of Budapest
43. Mr. George Kovach, General Manager, Great Northern Hotel, New York, N. Y., Colonel in the Military Intelligence, U. S. Army Reserve

## GROUP III

44. Admiral W. H. P. Blandy, U. S. N. (Ret.), Formerly Commander in Chief, U. S. Atlantic Fleet
45. Dr. Ralph Connor, Vice President in Charge of Research, Rohm and Haas Company
46. Captain A. A. Burke, U. S. N., Research and Development Board, National Military Establishment
47. Mr. H. R. Kimble, Physical Science Administrator, Bureau of Ordnance
48. Dr. C. R. Naeser, Professor of Chemistry, Head of Department, George Washington University
49. Dr. T. L. Brownyard, Physical Science Administrator, Bureau of Ordnance
50. Rear Admiral W. S. Parsons, U. S. N., Office of the Secretary of Defense.
51. Dr. J. G. Kirkwood, Professor of Chemistry, California Institute of Technology
52. Mrs. Dorothy Bandow, San Antonio, Texas, Formerly Secretary of Dr. Stephen Brunauer
53. Dr. S. R. Aspinall, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Williams College
54. Mr. Datus Smith, Director, Princeton University Press
55. Dr. Eugene Wigner, Professor of Physics, Princeton University

56. Dr. R. H. Cole, Professor of Chemistry, Head of Department, Brown University
57. Dr. J. S. Coles, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Brown University
58. Dr. J. O. Hirschfelder, Professor of Chemistry, University of Wisconsin, Director, University of Wisconsin Naval Research Laboratory
59. Mr. N. H. Bullard, Head Engineer, Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California
60. Mr. O. H. Loeffler, Ordnance Engineer, Bureau of Ordnance
61. Mr. Elliot B. Coulter, Assistant Chief, Visa Division, U. S. Department of State
62. Mr. Robert C. Alexander, Assistant Chief, Visa Division, U. S. Department of State
63. Captain W. M. Moses, U. S. N. (Ret.), Wilton, Connecticut
64. Mr. J. S. Harper, Chemical Engineer, Laurel, Mississippi
65. Dr. E. H. Cox, Professor of Chemistry, Head of Department, Swarthmore College
66. Dr. F. O. Rice, Professor of Chemistry, Head of Department, Catholic University of America
67. Dr. K. F. Herzfeld, Professor of Physics, Head of Department, Catholic University of America
68. Dr. A. H. Blatt, Professor of Chemistry, Queens College
69. Mr. J. E. Levy, Chemical Engineer, Bureau of Ordnance
70. Dr. R. D. Bennett, Technical Director, Naval Ordnance Laboratory
71. Captain W. B. Moore, U. S. N., Bureau of Ordnance
72. Mr. Lester Glickman, Engineer, Naval Ordnance Laboratory
73. Dr. W. M. Cady, Head, Physics Branch, Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California
74. Mr. J. S. McCorkle, Physicist, Bureau of Ordnance
75. Dr. Henry Eyring, Professor of Chemistry, Head of Department, University of Utah
76. Mr. W. F. Skinner, Assistant Director of Research, Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Va.
77. Dr. E. H. Eyster, Associate Division Chief, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory
78. Mr. R. W. Harris, Ordnance Engineer, Bureau of Ordnance
79. Miss Jacqueline Kitchens, Mathematical Analyst, Bureau of Ordnance
80. Dr. P. C. Cross, Professor of Chemistry, Head of Department, University of Washington
81. Dr. W. D. Kennedy, Senior Research Chemist, Tennessee Eastman Company
82. Dr. R. A. Beebe, Professor of Chemistry, Head of Department, Amherst College
83. Dr. L. R. Rumbaugh, Deputy Technical Director, Naval Ordnance Laboratory
84. Dr. L. H. Farinholt, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Columbia University
85. Dr. W. A. Noyes, Jr., Professor of Chemistry, Head of Department, University of Rochester
86. Dr. J. J. Stoker, Professor of Mathematics, New York University
87. Mr. R. L. Woodard, Administrator, Koppers Company
88. Colonel C. H. M. Roberts, U. S. A., Office of the Chief of Ordnance, Department of the Army
89. Mr. J. T. Manley, Director of Research, Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Virginia
90. Mr. E. C. Kenton, Manager, Evans Research and Development Corporation
91. Dr. Elijah Swift, Jr., Division Chief, Explosives Research Department, Naval Ordnance Laboratory
92. Miss Katharine Love, Chemist, U. S. Department of Agriculture
93. Dr. R. H. Brown, Instructor of Mathematics, Columbia University
94. Dr. D. V. Slickman, Division Chief, Explosives Research Department, Naval Ordnance Laboratory
95. Dr. F. H. Westheimer, Professor of Chemistry, University of Chicago
96. Mrs. Hazel P. Marsh, Formerly Lieutenant, U. S. Navy, Bureau of Ordnance
97. Captain J. A. E. Hindman, U. S. N., Bureau of Ordnance
98. Dr. Urner Liddel, Director, Natural Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research
99. Dr. B. H. Sage, Professor of Chemical Engineering, Head of Department, California Institute of Technology
100. Dr. W. E. Lawson, E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company
101. Mr. C. L. Tyler, Manager, Santa Fe Operations Office, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission

102. Dr. M. A. Tuve, Director, Department of Terrestrial Magnetism, Carnegie Institution of Washington  
 103. Dr. K. O. Friedrichs, Professor of Mathematics, New York University  
 104. Commander J. I. Cone, U. S. N., Commander Destroyer Division 12, U. S. Pacific Fleet

[Enclosure 3]

The Navy Department announces that Dr. Stephen Brunauer, who has been charged with being a Communist, served as a Commander, United States Naval Reserve, in the Bureau of Ordnance during the war, commencing in 1942. Subsequent to discharge, he was employed in the Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, where he is now serving in a civilian capacity. As an employee of that Bureau, Dr. Brunauer has been thoroughly investigated, and as a result of this investigation, administrative decision was made that there was not sufficient evidence to warrant Dr. Brunauer's being charged with having been disloyal and for that reason his case has not been referred to the Loyalty Board. While a commissioned officer during the war and later as an employee, Dr. Brunauer has made noteworthy contributions in the field of explosives. He is regarded as an eminent expert in that field and his ability in the field of research is highly regarded.

MARCH 13, 1950.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WASHINGTON, July 6, 1950.

The Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: You have asked me to inform your subcommittee concerning the circumstances of the appointment of Dr. Harlow Shapley to the United States National Commission for UNESCO. Dr. Shapley was designated by the Executive Committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science on May 20, 1947, to serve out the unexpired term of Dr. James Bryant Conant as the representative of that association on the national committee. On June 27, 1947, he was again designated by the association and has now served out his term, which expired April 15, 1950; Dr. Shapley was not, under Public Law 565, seventy-ninth Congress, eligible for reappointment.

Section 3 of Public Law 565 provides, in part, "Such Commission [United States National Commission for UNESCO] shall be appointed by the Secretary of State and shall consist of (a) not more than sixty representative of principal national, voluntary organizations interested in educational, scientific, and cultural matters \* \* \*". The Secretary of State has appointed to the National Commission in every instance the person designated by each such organization to serve on the Commission. This seems to be in accord with the intent of Congress as expressed in the legislative history of the act. In the course of debate concerning the legislation, Congressman Karl Mundt (Republican, South Dakota) said:

"\* \* \* it seems to me if we are going to have an advisory commission that is worth its salt it should be an advisory commission that is not obligated to anybody, not obligated to the Secretary of State, not obligated to any political party, not obligated to any point of view, but one which reflects and represents the views of the organizations to which in turn these delegates are supposed to carry the inspiration and the message and the information of UNESCO.

"Consequently, I want people selected from these organizations in whom the organizations have confidence. I want the Secretary of State to choose the man nominated by these various organizations so that they can go to the advisory conferences, consult and advise with the Secretary of State, so that our Government officials may have the benefit of this great cross section of information."

Congressman Mundt, whose interest in and support of the principles of UNESCO extends over many years, sponsored H. Res. 215, introduced on April 9, 1945, and agreed to by the House of Representatives on May 22, 1945. This resolution urged the participation of the United States in the creation of an international

framework within which educational and cultural relations could be considered and promoted in their various aspects.

It should be added that Dr. Shapley was appointed as a member of the United States Delegation to the Preparatory Conference for UNESCO at London in 1945 under former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes. His participation in the work of UNESCO has stemmed from the outset from his position as a scientist and member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. PEURIFOY,  
Deputy Under Secretary.

The following letters were received by the Foreign Relations Subcommittee in response to its invitations to the persons publicly charged by Senator McCarthy to either appear before the subcommittee as a witness or else submit a statement of their position:

OLD WESTBURY, LONG ISLAND, N. Y., May 10, 1950.

EDWARD P. MORGAN, Esq.,

Chief Counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORGAN: I have your letter of May 4, 1950, acknowledging the receipt of the documents submitted to the subcommittee on March 30, 1950, and offering me the opportunity to reply to Senator McCarthy's charges in public. I appreciate your offer and the spirit in which this opportunity is afforded me.

You will recall that, in my letter of March 30, 1950, I explained to Senator Tydings the difficulty of my position. As a member of the United Nations Secretariat, I am required to observe the spirit and substance of article 100 of the United Nations Charter. That article reads in part:

"In the performance of their duties the Secretary-General and the staff shall not seek nor receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organization."

For the above reason, and because I must leave on May 17, 1950, for Italy and Switzerland on official United Nations business, I do not feel that I can take advantage of the opportunity offered me by the subcommittee. I expect to return to the United States in late July.

I should tell you that I have caused to be sent to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a copy of the letter and memorandum of March 30, 1950, which I sent to Senator Tydings. I have also sent a copy of that letter and memorandum to Mr. Willard Barber of the State Department. I am enclosing herewith a copy of the memorandum, in affidavit form, which I have subscribed, sworn to, and acknowledged before a notary public of the State of New York. I do this to indicate that that memorandum contains all the pertinent facts known to me and to show that I have no hesitation whatsoever in adhering to them under oath. I should be only too happy, of course, to answer any questions pertaining to, or make any additional statements in explanation of, the facts which I have given in the memorandum when and if you, Senator Tydings, or other members of the subcommittee request it.

Respectfully yours,

GUSTAVO DURAN.

Enc. affidavit.

By registered mail.

#### MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR TYDINGS

On March 14, when I read the first reports on the charges made against me Senator McCarthy before the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee, I issued a statement denying the specific charges that had come to my attention and stating that I was not and never had been a Communist. I also said that I suspected that the so-called United States Army Intelligence Report on which Senator McCarthy was basing most of his allegations was nothing more than a literal translation of an article published in the April 9, 1946, issue of the Madrid newspaper *Arriba* which is the mouthpiece of the Falange Party of Franco Spain.

I have now had an opportunity to examine in detail the testimony of Senator McCarthy before the subcommittee, and my suspicions as to his sources have been fully confirmed.

I had thought that those accusations had long since been laid to rest. Both the charges and the exhibits which appeared to substantiate them were found to be entirely baseless and misleading by the State Department Security Committee in 1946. Even the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which had first given publicity to the charges, decided against pressing the matter any further. You have before you the letter, dated September 14, 1946, of Mr. Donald Russell, then Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Personnel Affairs, in which it is stated that the Security Committee, after reviewing the entire record as procured from all available sources, recommended favorably on me.

With only one or two easily refutable exceptions, Senator McCarthy has come forward with no new charges, and no additional material with which to support his accusations. I therefore cannot understand why the conclusions of the Security Committee and Mr. Donald Russell are not equally as valid today as they were in 1946. For the sake of clearing the record once and for all, and in the hope that these unfounded accusations will never again arise to disturb the peace to which my family and I are entitled, I wish to lay before you and the subcommittee the facts as they are known to me, and as they are known to the Security Committee and to all those responsible persons who have known me intimately for a period of many years. In this connection, I am attaching a biographical sketch of my family background and career.

The testimony of Senator McCarthy is based on (a) a United States Military Intelligence Report, dated June 4, 1946, which, in turn, is based on a report given the United States Military Attaché at Madrid by the A. C. of S., G-2, Spanish Central General Staff; (b) a report made by Mr. Indalecio Prieto on August 9, 1938, before the National Committee of the Spanish Socialist Workers Party, and subsequently incorporated in a pamphlet entitled "How and Why I left the Ministry of National Defense"; (c) statements made by Lt. Edward J. Ruff, Assistant United States Military Attaché in the Dominican Republic; and (d) information allegedly obtained directly by Senator McCarthy or by his assistants.

(a) As I pointed out in my statement to the press, the Spanish Army Intelligence Report which was incorporated in the report of the United States Military Attaché was a literal reproduction of a scurrilous attack on me published in the April 9, 1946, issue of the Madrid newspaper *Arriba*, which is the mouthpiece of the Falange Party of Franco Spain.

The article in *Arriba* was published as part of the campaign of the Franco Government to counter disclosures that had been made by the United States State Department on the relations between Nazi Germany and Franco Spain during the last World War. These disclosures were actually excerpts from the captured records of the German Foreign Office, but the Franco Government broadcast the story in Madrid, first on February 28, 1946, and subsequently on March 3, 1946, that I had personally fabricated the disclosures. The Franco Government, which had paid no attention to me for seven years, suddenly undertook to make me an agent of Moscow and to smear my character in the vilest possible way.

A clipping of this article was forwarded to the United States Government by the United States Naval Attaché in Madrid, under Intelligence Report No. 135-46 dated April 15, 1946. I have a photostatic copy of the article in my possession, a copy and translation of which I am attaching hereto. Comparison of the article with the wording and very order of the Spanish Military Intelligence Report shows that both documents are identical.

When in May 1946 the United States Military Attaché requested information on me from the Intelligence Service of the Spanish Central General Staff, the Franco Government, feeling that at that moment it would serve its purposes to smear my character, and being unable to produce a single instance of substantial evidence, resorted to sending to the United States Military Attaché a literal copy of the *Arriba* article. Apparently the Military Attaché had no knowledge that the article had been already transmitted by the Naval Attaché at the time of its publication, and therefore accepted the Spanish Military Intelligence report as a bona fide document based on actual facts. Aside from the misrepresentations concerning my character and beliefs, the report contains such gross inaccuracies regarding easily ascertainable facts, such as my birthplace and residence, that had the Military Attaché taken the precaution of checking these facts, he would have questioned the validity of the report.

Having established the unreliable character of Senator McCarthy's chief source of information, I would like to examine the charges one by one.

that of Chief of the Mission beginning in February 1930 and ending in May 1941. I then went to Australia as American Minister and was there from September 1941 until April 1945. I retired from the Foreign Service on the first of April 1946 and have been temporarily employed by the Department of State since that date and acting as Secretary General to the Far Eastern Commission, which is an international organization established for the purpose of formulating policy in connection with the occupation of Japan.

Q. When did you become Chief of Mission in China, sir? What year was that?—A. It was—I presented my credentials, I think, on February 2, 1940.

Q. In 1930?—A. Yes; 1930.

Q. You're acquainted with Mr. Service, are you?—A. Yes; I know Mr. Service. I think my first acquaintance with his family was when I met his father and mother out in Chungking back in the early twenties. Then when I was in Peiping as Chief of Mission Mr. Service came to Peiping as a language attaché. I have forgotten the exact year, but I think it was about 1935. I'm not too certain about that year. He was there for the usual 2-year period of study, passed his examinations, as I recall, with ease, and then was assigned to the field as a vice consul and has continued in the career service since that time.

Mr. ACHILLES. Pardon me, may I ask a question at that point. Did you ever have any indication that Mr. Service's parents were in any way communistically inclined?—A. None whatever. I said that I met the parents there. I didn't know them but they were engaged in, I think, the YMCA, wasn't it?

Mr. SERVICE. Yes.

A. In western China, and I never heard the slightest report that the Service family was engaged in anything other than the most respectable and most respected occupations in China. If there had ever been any reports of that kind I'm certain that I would have heard some gossip about it. I never did. In fact they were held in the highest respect by those who knew them and by the Chinese.

Questions by Mr. RHERTS:

Q. After Mr. Service graduated as a language attaché and was assigned to the consulate, was his work in general under your administrative supervision at all?—A. No; it was not. And he did not come under my personal observation again until he was assigned to the American Embassy or that portion of the American Embassy which was temporarily stationed at Chungking. In April 1941, just about, well, I think it was less than a month before I left to go to Australia, Mr. Service arrived on that detail. I saw something of him during those days when I was getting ready to leave. I do not recall that I saw him again until I met him here in Washington in 1945.

Q. Now, during the period that you had occasion to know him in China, first in Peiping and later in Chungking, did you have an opportunity to form a judgment about his general competence and his general political orientation at all?—A. Well, I would put it this way, that during the period that Mr. Service was attached to the Embassy as a language attaché there was nothing that occurred that would have attracted my attention in any way, shape or form to his political activities because unless there was something peculiar about them I would not have paid any attention to them. He was a member of the group of students attached to the Legation at the time I mentioned who came under my observation who were intelligent and who did their work with credit and who were, insofar as the reports which came to me from those who I had immediate supervision over their studies, intellectually honest.

There was no occasion, so far as I can recall, for my being interested at all in Mr. Service's political orientation or outlook. Certainly when I was associated, on occasions, with Mr. Service and his wife and those of his group of students, nothing ever happened, nothing was ever said, nothing ever came to me, that indicated that I should be in any sense of the word interested.

Q. In that connection, sir, if—during this period in Peiping—Mr. Service had been in any way active politically and communistically inclined, would you have expected that his immediate supervisors would in turn have reported to you would have brought that fact to your attention?—A. Well, I would certainly expect that that would happen because the reports on the personnel attached to the Legation were all signed by myself once a year and, as my mind goes back to those days and to the preparation of those reports, they were discussed among the senior members of the staff and those who came into immediate contact with the subjects of the reports so that if there had been anything peculiar about any of these young men I would have known it.

I remember one or two who were peculiar and who eventually disappeared in that strange way that mist has of disappearing in the morning for this reason or that reason. Their reasons were never too clear but it was my recollection that their disappearance was due chiefly to lack of interest in their work or lack of interest in the particular subject of Chinese which they were concentrating on.

Mr. ACHILLES. Did you have at any time any indication that Mr. Service was opposed to or not in sympathy with American policy toward China at the time?—A. None whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. Now the question you originally asked, counsel?

Questions by Mr. RHETTS:

Q. With respect to this particular period you mentioned, sir, I take it you are referring to the efficiency reports which are annually made on each of the Foreign Service officers?—A. The efficiency reports that were made on the personnel in the Embassy at Peiping that ran all the way from those immediately junior to me on down to the last messenger.

Q. In that connection, am I correct in believing that the matter of preparation of these annual efficiency reports in the Foreign Service is a matter which is given very careful attention?—A. In my own particular case I tried to give them a special personal consideration because I had served for 2½ years, I think it was, as an inspecting officer—through the years 1922, 1923, 1924, and I know it was a phase of the work that I was particularly interested in. I had been interested in the personnel of the Foreign Service. I have been connected with it quite a long time. I have seen it grow. I have been sympathetic with it. I have been interested in the kind of young men that have come out to the Far East and interested themselves in the service in the Far East.

I was instrumental in a small way when I served in the Department in working over the regulations for that service. I helped somewhat in the discussions connected with the examinations for those young men. And I have been extremely interested in the type of young men, the kind of young men, and the kind of work that they were doing. So that when we prepared these efficiency reports or these personnel reports once a year I tried to give them a special consideration for that reason.

Now, of course, in preparing an efficiency report you sometimes are reporting on personnel who you're not too intimately acquainted with. But you have to build it on that. And you should build on that. I have always understood that these reports were given very serious consideration here in the Department. And I have always felt myself that if the man in the field didn't put some of himself into it that they were of no use here whatever.

Q. Turning to the later period in Chungking when Mr. Service became attached to the Embassy there, did you, during the course of your conversation and contact with him at that time, have any basis to reach a judgment about his political views and outlook?—A. The time that Mr. Service was with me in Chungking of course was a very short one, extending from about the middle of April 1941 until I left. I left in about the middle of May. And during that period of time he was just newly attached. There was no occasion for me to have any reason to read anything. I don't know whether he wrote anything during that time that I should have read. But I'd like to say that during that period of time when I was preparing to leave and when I saw and greeted Service—as a young man in whom I had been interested and who was now rejoining my staff in a sense—I welcomed him there and I certainly did not at any time have the slightest indication from anybody or do I recall anything that he ever said to me or he ever said in my presence that would have alarmed me in any sense of the word as to his political views.

I'd like to say in this connection I have been in the service a long time and as young men come on in the service they all come with new ideas, ideas that are the product of their own environment, the product of their own training. And the first thing that I recognized or have tried to train myself to recognize in relation to the personnel that I have had to deal with was their right to see things as they saw them, and I certainly expected them to speak to me of them as they saw them and not as they thought I would like them to see them. It just happens that in this case there was never any occasion, as far as I know, for Mr. Service to make any reports to me about things that he saw. But I have been curious about this matter, of course, and I have within recent months turned up memoranda which have been attributed to Mr. Service and which have been printed in the volume issued by the Department of State having special reference to "United States policy with regard to China," and I believe



recognized because they were already so strong that it was impossible to overthrow them in any way by force of arms and a political accommodation was the only alternative to a civil war. He also did not feel that a hopeful future could be based on the Chinese Central Government in the absence of a reform program.

I am not a very good person to judge the rights and the wrongs of that attitude, but as to how possible it might have been or might not have been for the Chinese Central Government to carry on a reform program, but that the Central Government could not clean up on all of China by force of arms and win a civil war against the Communists without the involvement of this country on a scale which would really have been beyond our resources seems absolutely clear to me and reflects not just the views of Mr. Service but the views of people like General Wedemeyer and I am sure others of very high American officers who had to do with China at that time. As I see this difference it could only be this, that General Hurley felt that we should have been giving greater backing to the Central Government in its differences with the Communists than Mr. Service and others would have recommended.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any questions?

Mr. STEVENS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Mr. Counsel.

Questions by Mr. RHETTS:

Q. Mr. Kennan, in connection with this line of inquiry which General Snow has just been pursuing, in particular General Hurley has singled out a report No. 40, which is document No. 193 in the list that you have, General Hurley has stated that that memorandum in particular constituted in his judgment—and he has stated this, I may say, in the course of hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in December 1945—he has stated that this was a plan to bring about the fall of the Central Government, and that charge in turn had been picked up by Senator McCarthy and others and elaborated on. I wonder if you have any particular notes on 193?—A. I do, indeed. I would like to refresh my memory from the document itself.

Yes, my notes on it were here that:

"Service's denunciation is strong but based exclusively on the urgency of aiding the American war effort in the Pacific. There is no indication of political bias toward any faction but only against Kuomintang corruption and power politics. There is a tendency to underplay the usefulness of the Kuomintang to the United States war effort and to discount any worth in the movement as an interesting parallel to Yugoslavia."

If I might be excused, I would like to run my eyes over this again (referring to report 40).

The CHAIRMAN. Would you do that again, please.

A. (After reading the report.) Mr. Chairman, may I make a further statement with respect to this, since we are getting into the actual question of the content of these reports. I think that what is said here in one part is extraordinarily penetrating, and that is:

"Encouraged by our support the Kuomintang will continue its present course, progressively losing the confidence of the people and becoming more and more impotent."

That has been directly borne out by the course of events. There is no question about that. It goes ahead and says:

"Ignored by us, and excluded from the Government and joint prosecution of the war, the Communists and other groups will be forced to guard their own interests by more direct opposition."

That you can give as you like, that has happened. I have never known myself, never felt able really to judge, I have always been skeptical about it, I have never known whether any sort of a tolerable political accommodation could have been reached between the Chinese Communists and the Central Government in China. In other countries the Communists have never been comfortable bedfellows for anybody, and the ideological instructions under which they work tell them to enter into alliance with political groups only for the sake of ruining these groups from the inside, and eventually emerging the sole victors.

Now there is a question of judgment here as to whether it would have been—the Chinese Communists were enough different from other Communists so that they would have gone into any coalition effort in good faith, and all I can say, I believe that there were some hesitations in Mr. Service's mind about that but as I gather it from the reports he felt that this was the only possibility, the only alternative possibility to a civil war which probably would have ended

only in the complete Chinese Communist triumph. I think I should explain that. I mean, at the time I would have been skeptical about the possibility of the lion and the lamb lying down together and anything resembling a real regime coming out of it, but on the other hand I don't know Chinese realities remotely as well as he does, and you can balance off the knowledge of Chinese realities on the one hand against the knowledge of the international Communist realities on the other.

Mr. ACHILLES. On that point General Hurley's writings indicate that he had no qualms about the desirability of the Chinese taking the Communists into the government. Had he had enough experience with Soviet communism in Moscow and so on so that he should have known better or was he too new to that?

A. His visits to Moscow consisted only of one or two brief stays in that capital, to my knowledge, and talks with Stalin and Molotov. I don't think that that was enough to enable him to know what he was talking about when he reported on the views of the Soviet leaders. On the other hand, there was ample advice available to him which he showed no desire to tap on these subjects. I mean, it is not surprising to me that Hurley didn't know that he was being given the usual run-around and the usual patter by Stalin and Molotov, but I think that if he had been a wiser and more thoughtful man he would have asked some people who would be familiar with those conditions for some years for commentary on those.

Q. In that connection I take it that what you have commented, that the essential question of judgment as to whether there was any future in attempting to effect a political accommodation is an open question. Is it not fair to say, however, Mr. Kennan, that that question of judgment as a matter of official American policy had been decided by the President and by the State Department and that General Hurley accepted, if he had not been a partial architect of, the judgment that we should seek to effect that political accommodation?—A. That is quite correct, and it is my understanding that General Hurley had in a sense launched the most vigorous phase of our effort to bring precisely that about and went himself to Yanan and brought these Communist leaders down in his own plan and worked very vigorously toward the implementation of that idea.

Q. So that although that may have been questionable judgment, it was the unquestioned policy of the United States Government to seek to effect that accommodation?—A. Yes.

Q. Referring back to this Document 193 and to the other aspects of it, do you see any evidence in that document which would support the charge by General Hurley that it was a plan to bring about the fall of the Central Government?—A. No. My understanding of the document was that Mr. Service said we should not fear the fall of the Central Government and not permit ourselves to be blackmailed by the threat of it, but not that he himself advocated it.

Q. And, indeed, does not the document further suggest that this is the only way to avoid the fall, as he saw it?—A. Let me just finish my reexamination because among 127 documents I don't want to speak about this until I glance at it again.

(Reread the document.)

I must say that I found in this document a strong belief that the Chinese Government as it existed at that time did not have in it the qualities which would have made it possible for it to play a constructive role in the future of China and that we would not help to create those qualities in it by aiding it ourselves in the policies that it was then conducting, but I did not find in it a specific desire that the Chinese Government as existed then should fall from power entirely.

Now again I would say, reverting to a prior questions about conflict, about General Hurley's assertion that this involved some disloyalty to United States policy, that I could find in going through his reports no indication in anything there other than a desire to make plain to our Government what Mr. Service felt our policy should be. Now that has never been considered in Government practice to have in it any impropriety. It would have been, rather, improper if for some reason or other he had failed to tell the Government of his own true thoughts about it, had concealed them from the Government in any respect or for some motives of his own, and I would have found an impropriety in this only if he had been doing this on behalf of somebody else and had not let the Government know the real motives of his making these recommendations. To my mind they stand or fall on the question of whether they were honestly made

and honestly believed, and if then they were that, then the only other question could be, about them could have been whether they reflected good judgment or bad judgment, and that was a question, as I say, for the Government, which the Government was at liberty to examine. I would feel very alarmed for the future of Foreign Service reporting if we ever were to permit the implication to creep in that a policy recommendation contrary to the policy that was actually adopted by the Government was a sign of disloyalty to the Government purposes, because as ones who perhaps in making policy every day in this building here we know that—as most of us who are in this position—probably the majority of things we recommended are never accepted, but we must continue to recommend them and out of that discussion and difference of opinion will emerge a policy which people then loyal will accept.

I also gather from what General Hurley wrote here that there is an indication that these observers in Yenan had given the Chinese Communists a false picture of what to expect from our Government. I do not find any indication of that. On the contrary, I notice in one report here that there were warnings given to the Chinese Communists that they should not hope for too much, that no decisions had been made, and that there was a specific effort to keep them from getting their hopes too high and being carried away.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean by that, in his talks with the Communists he had indicated that, as you just stated, to them?—A. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Not that the report itself had been made available to the Communists?

A. No, no. There would, I believe, have been an impropriety if one had gone to the Chinese Communists and promised them a line of conduct on the part of our Government which had not yet been sanctioned in any policy determinations at home, but I can find no indication of that in the reports. Rather, on the contrary.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions?

A. It was in Document 188:

"Every effort has been made to avoid encouraging any high expectations, to point out the practical difficulties in the way of direct cooperation, and to suggest that Japan may be defeated in other ways than as the Communists insist, a slow process of liquidating the armies on the Asian mainland."

Q. Now, on the basis of your examination of these documents, Mr. Kennan, I should like to call your attention that Senator McCarthy and others have charged that Mr. Service during this period was trying to turn the Far East over to Russia, and it has been further asserted that Mr. Service expressed the view that communism was the best hope of China or the best hope of Asia, variously. Do you find anything in any of his writings that tended in any way to support such statements?—A. No; let me think of those. Trying to turn it all over—

Q. Trying to turn the Far East over to Russia?—A. No; I find the direct contrary to that proposition in these reports. The second was that—

Q. That communism was the best hope of Asia?—A. No; my understanding of what he said in these reports was that the best hope in China, to which his observations were restricted, was a regime which would be considerate of the interests of the opposition elements including the Communists, which is quite a difference.

Q. Yes. By the way, Mr. Kennan, will you state to the Board whether you are acquainted with Mr. Service?—A. I had never met Mr. Service before he returned on this occasion, and I have never spoken with him except concerning the technical arrangements for my appearing here. I purposely did not discuss anything that I was going to say on this occasion with him or with anyone that I thought might be in communication with him and have never discussed the content of his reports. I had also not read the reports before this except insofar as they were contained in the white paper, so that they came to me fresh.

Q. And you have not discussed these reports with Mr. Service at any time?—A. No; at no time.

Q. Or discussed them with me?—A. No; at no time.

Mr. MORELAND. Or members of the Board?

The CHAIRMAN. That is also true of the members of the Board?

A. It is also true of the members of the Board. I had meant to make that clear myself.

I am sure that the only thing I could add, I think, to what I have said so far voluntarily about the reports is that in their entirety there is no question about it, aside from the question of whether they might have a bias in favor of the

Communists, that they represent an absolutely outstanding job of reporting, on general Foreign Service terms. Many of them have nothing to do with this matter whatsoever. They are an excellent series of reports and recognized as such by the Department. I don't know whether that has any bearing; that is why I didn't mention it before, except that people who write excellent reports are not apt to be guilty of the great oversimplifications which have been suggested by some people.

Q. Just one question. I believe that during the early forties, as you testified earlier, the officials of the Soviet Union had generally expressed the view that they were not interested in the Chinese Communists and that they did not really regard them as true Communists at all. While necessarily over-simplification, is that generally a correct characterization of the Soviet Communist Party line, that the Chinese Communists were not real Communists?—A. That seems to have been a line taken in conversation by certain of the Soviet leaders during the war. I don't recall ever having seen it in the very carefully controlled written line that they put out, and it is my belief that it was not part of that.

Q. It was at any rate, I take it, clearly the line as put out by Messrs. Stalin and Molotov to General Hurley?—A. That is General Hurley's report, and he reported—I was not there that night, Mr. Harriman went up with him and left that following morning—that Molotov agreed that that was the line that he and Stalin were taking, that these were not real Communists and that—just as you described.

Q. Did you detect any indication anywhere in Mr. Service's writing that he did not regard the Chinese Communists as true Communists?—A. Yes; I had the impression that particularly in the earlier period of his stay in Yenan he thought it possible the influences of their experience as a political movement, the extent to which they had been thrown upon themselves in their long march around China, and isolation during the war, and the pressures of purely Chinese psychological influences on them might have changed them in such a way as would make them untypical of the majority of Communists, of all the other Communist parties approved by the Kremlin, and might reconcile them to ruling by means which would be more like what we would consider democratic for a long period even if they came to power in China.

Q. In that connection do you recall any of his reports which commented particularly on whether or not the Chinese Communist Party was even though modified by its peculiar experiences essentially a Marxian political party?—A. Yes. There was one from Yenan in the earlier period there. I would have to look it up to be able to cite the exact one to you which did comment on that point. Just a moment now. It was No. 168, I believe. My recollection is that in that report he said that he believed that the Chinese Communist Party aimed for an orderly and prolonged progress toward eventual socialism and not for violent revolution, and that it would consider the long-term interests of China and would not seek for an early monopoly of political power. I believe however that those views changed in the course of his service in Yenan and that in the latter part of his service there he felt that there was less likelihood that they would not strive for monopoly of power. I hope I don't misquote him on that. I have here this report—let me see if I can find some of the passages that are pertinent. He did not say that they were not Marxists, I think I should add, but it was a question of what interpretation they would give to their own Marxism, and if you will permit me I will read this report, the passage that I recall.

“The Chinese Communist Party claims that it is Marxist. By this the Communists mean that their ideology, their philosophical approach, and their dialectal method are based on Marx materialism. Marxism thus becomes to it chiefly an attitude and an approach to problems. It is a long-term view of political and economic developments to which all short-term considerations of temporary advantage or premature power are ruthlessly subordinated. This interpretation of Marxist materialism means to them a certain logical development of economic society. It also means that this natural sequence cannot be short-circuited. To try to do so would be disastrous and a violation of their basic principles of strategy. Thus socialism in their view cannot be evolved at one jump from the present primitive agrarian society of China. It can come only after considerable development of the Chinese autonomy and after it has passed through a stage of at least modified capitalism. Their communism therefore does not mean the immediate overthrow of private capital because there is still almost no capitalism in China. It does not mean the dictatorship of the proletariat because there is as yet no proletariat. It does not mean

collectivism of farms because the political education of the peasants has not yet overcome their primitive individualistic desire to till their own land."

And he goes on at some length here to describe the view, ending with this conclusion:

"By this view the Communist Party becomes a party seeking orderly democratic growth toward socialism, as is being attempted for instance, in a country like England, rather than a party fomenting immediate and violent revolution. It becomes a party which is not seeking an early monopoly of political power but pursuing what it considers the long-term interests in China. It bases this seemingly idealistic policy on a rigid interpretation of materialism which holds it to be a violation of those materialistic principles to attempt to force the country into socialism before the natural development of the country's economy makes socialism possible."

That is the end of that quote.

Q. That, of course, is essential Marxism doctrine, too, is it not?—A. I would say subsequent history has borne out this analysis insofar as it related to the internal economic policies of the Chinese Communist Government. I don't think that Government has at the present moment any intention of collectivizing all Chinese agriculture or stamping out all Chinese capitalism. There is no question about that. It has a judgment here which I think has not actually materialized today and that is that "It is a party seeking orderly democratic growth towards socialism." However I must bear in mind in connection with that statement that he had prior to that time said that if this thing ended in a civil war with ourselves backing the central government of China these Chinese Communists would be impelled more in the direction of Moscow, and that after this time also his reports reflect greater skepticism on this point of whether you would expect a democratic development in the Chinese Communist Party.

Q. I have no further question.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Kennan, for taking your valuable time for our benefit. You did a very fine report.

(The witness was dismissed, a short recess was declared, and the Board reconvened to hear continuation of testimony by Mr. John Davies.)

The CHAIRMAN. We will recommence questions by Mr. Stevens.

Questions by Mr. STEVENS:

Q. Mr. Davies, you will remember on Saturday I asked you about your trip to Yenan?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Sometime between October and January. I wonder if you are familiar with Mr. Service's memorandum 40, about which Mr. Hurley commented a considerable amount in his Senate testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. That is Document No. 193.

A. Yes, I recall this document. I had not seen it, I think, since 1944.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you like to have a chance to look at it?

A. Well, I can identify it.

Q. Did you receive that when you were in New Delhi or in Yenan, sir?—A. I probably got this in Yenan. I think by that time—I have forgotten, when was Stilwell relieved?

Mr. SERVICE. October 19.

A. I may have gotten that in New Delhi. I doubt if it would have gone through that quickly. If not, I probably saw it in Yenan or Chungking.

Q. Did you ever discuss the contents of that memorandum with other than a Government person in Yenan, sir?—A. No. It was certainly our firm policy not to discuss with any Chinese any American official documents. We went so far as to mark our documents, many of them, "for American official eyes only," some such phraseology as that, because we suspected that some reporting documents by Foreign Service officers were being shown to Chinese officials in Chungking, and it was an established policy with us that we should not reveal to any Chinese in any position what we were reporting about the internal affairs in China.

Q. Would you have revealed that to any newspaperman, sir? Would you have shown that document to anyone other than an official of the United States Government?—A. This document I don't think I would have. I can't conceive of having shown this one because this was obviously a pretty hot document.

Q. Your answer then would be that you did not?—A. That I did not.

Q. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ACHILLES. You never gave a copy of that or sent a copy of that to anyone not in an official capacity?

A. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was examining? Were you, Mr. Counsel, examining?

Mr. RHETTS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you proceed?

Questions by Mr. RHETTS:

Q. We had, I believe, at the end of the proceeding on Saturday been discussing again this matter of the whole matter of policy and dealings with the press, and I believe the last thing we did was introduce an affidavit by Colonel Jones, who was the public relations officer for the theater, so unless the Board wishes to pursue that general subject matter further, I would propose to go on to some other topics.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, proceed.

Mr. STEVENS. May I ask, sir, Document No. 323 is the one you were talking about, that you introduced on Saturday, is it not?

Q. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEVENS. Was that placed in as a part of the transcript or as an exhibit?

Q. It is part of the transcript.

Mr. STEVENS. Right.

Q. Now, Mr. Davies, I wonder if you can summarize in some way for the Board the general views which the political advisers group, that is the group of political advisers attached to General Stilwell, came to hold regarding the type of solution of the political problems in China which the United States ought to seek to accomplish in order to further our interests in the prosecution of the war there?—A. I think that those views are fairly well summarized in the white paper on China. I don't see much point in reiterating those. You are familiar with them.

Q. But you would say that the views that are expressed there, and I take it you refer particularly to the annex 47 which deals with this phase.—A. Yes.

Q. Fairly represents the thinking of your whole group on this question?—

A. Yes. There is one point in the summary or in the white paper which I would like to elaborate on a bit. I might say that I was the only one of the so-called political advisers who attempted to discuss in any detail the broadest problems of international politics, although the interpretations which I advanced were in no way binding on my colleagues, as they were simply the reporting efforts of one or of another junior officer. I believe I am accurate in stating that Mr. Emmerson went along with what I had to say regarding the international scene. I believe that Mr. Service shared with me a basic assumption that the U. S. S. R. would be the principal power rival of the United States in the Far East and that as such the U. S. S. R. was, although at the moment our ally, also our future enemy.

During the period 1943-45 this was not a theme which was widely proclaimed for obvious and sound reasons. However, it was introduced into our reporting at various times. You will find hints of it in the excerpts from our memoranda which I just referred to published in the white paper. I would, with the Board's permission, like to read several further paragraphs from my reports in an endeavor to throw more light on our attitude toward the U. S. S. R. In a memorandum dated September 17, 1943, I discussed Soviet policy in review of global policy, and I had this to say:

"Absorbed in their struggle with the Germans and realizing that they cannot depend upon Britain and the United States to defeat the wehrmacht for them, the Russian policy appears to have been less political than that of the British and the Chinese. In its singleness of purpose—confined to the defeat of the enemy—it has resembled ours.

"But while we follow such a policy from choice, the Russians have done so from necessity. A mortal struggle for survival leaves little slack for political picking and choosing. British policy in 1940 and 1941 and Chinese policy before Pearl Harbor had the same attributes of simplicity.

"Once the Russians feel, however, that they have won their fight for survival and that they have some leeway for maneuver, it will not be surprising if they begin to make their military strategy subservient to an over-all political policy. That point may already have been reached.

"It is perhaps not too early to suggest that Soviet policy will probably be directed initially at establishing frontiers which will insure Russian security and at rehabilitation of the U. S. S. R. There is no reason to cherish optimism regarding a voluntary Soviet contribution to our fight against Japan, whether in the shape of air bases or the early opening of a second front in northeast Asia. The Russians may be expected to move against the Japanese when it

suits their pleasure, which may not be until the final phases of the war—and then only in order to be able to participate in dictating terms to the Japanese and to establish new strategic frontiers.

"At this point it may be worth while to insert comments on our bargaining position. As the Soviet Union's peril diminishes its need for our aid diminishes. In direct proportion as the Kremlin feels its need of American assistance lessening, our bargaining position becomes weaker and we are less able to persuade the Russians to act as we desire. We appear to have made little use of our bargaining strength with the Soviet Union, because, perhaps, we were not prepared to force through what we wanted and because we would not have been prepared to exploit our advantage even had we done so. Now we find our bargaining strength with the Russians slipping away. \* \* \*

A few months later in June, June 24, 1943, I had this to say:

"It would only be natural that, should Chiang attack the Communists, the latter would turn for aid to their immediate neighbor, the Soviet Union. And as such an attack would probably not be launched until after the defeat of Japan, the Communists might expect with good reason to receive Russian aid.

"This would be so because following the defeat of Japan Russia would no longer be threatened on its eastern borders, because the Kremlin's present need of Chiang Kai-shek's cooperation would have passed, because Stalin would then presumably prefer to have a friendly if not satellite Chinese Government on his flank, and because the Soviet Union would then have surplus arms in abundance for export.

"A central government attack would therefore in all probability force the Communists into the willing arms of the Russians. The position of the political doctrinaires who have been subservient to Moscow would be strengthened by such an attack. The present trend of the Chinese Communists toward more or less democratic nationalism—confirmed in 6 years of fighting for the Chinese motherland—would thereby be reversed and they could be expected to retrogress to the position of a Russian satellite.

"In these circumstances they would not be a weak satellite. With Russian arms, with Russian technical assistance and with the popular appeal which they have, the Chinese Communists might be expected to defeat the central government and eventually to take over the control of most if not all of China. It may be assumed that a Russo-Chinese bloc, with China as a subservient member of the partnership, would not be welcomed by us. The effect of such a bloc upon the rest of Asia and upon world stability would be undesirable."

Then on February 19, 1944, I observed:

"Nowhere does Clausewitz's dictum that war is only the continuation of politics by other methods apply with more force than in the Asiatic theater. If we are to plan intelligently the conduct of our war against Japan we must clearly define and understand our long-range political objectives in Asia.

"Presumably we seek in Asia (1) the greatest possible stability after the war, and (2) an alinement of power favorable to us when we again become involved in an Asiatic or Pacific war."

That is the end of the reading.

Q. Now, in that connection you say that you were satisfied that Mr. Service in general agreed with those views, that they represent views held by him as well as by you?—A. Yes: I was convinced of that, and still am.

Q. Do you have knowledge that Mr. Service shared the views that you have just expressed?—A. We had discussed these questions back and forth. He left to me the reporting on the broader, international picture, but this general approach became really the tacit basis upon which the further development of our political ideas with respect to the local situation was worked out.

Q. And I take it that insofar as Senator McCarthy, for example, has charged that Mr. Service thought to turn the whole Far East over to Russia, you would say that that was not any part of his objective, if he shared the views that you just expressed?—A. It would be fantastic because this was the basic assumption, that there was the power conflict with the Soviet Union as the force which would challenge us in a power rivalry at the end of World War II, and that our next problem would be to prevent the Soviet Union from becoming the dominant power in Asia.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Davies, did you send copies of your reports, such as the ones you have read, to Mr. Service?

A. Yes; copies—well, let me go on. Two of these reports I believe were written before Mr. Service joined me, but he went through the whole files and we discussed this general outlook together, so he was familiar with these and he expressed general agreement.

Mr. STEVENS. Did he express on any of the points you raised disagreement?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now I would like you to look at document No. 35-5. I show you document 35-5, which is already in evidence here, which represents a statement by General Hurley of the policy objectives or slightly varying versions of the policy objectives which he sought to pursue in China.

(Mr. Davies read document 35-5.)

Q. Now I would like to ask you whether on the basis of your knowledge of Mr. Service's writings and your knowledge of his views apart from his writings, whether Mr. Service ever was in disagreement with any of these stated policy objectives?—A. I can't see that he ever was, so far as my knowledge of Mr. Service's reporting and his personal ideas, and so on.

Q. Now referring to document No. 35-3, General Hurley has charged that Mr. Service and other Foreign Service officers in China were pro-Communist. Did you ever hear Mr. Service make any expression of view which would render any support to this charge by General Hurley?—A. American Foreign Service officers are trained to be pro-American first. They are dedicated to that proposition. They evaluate foreign situations—and I say this of Mr. Service now specifically. He evaluated the local Chinese situation, the political factors that were there in terms of what was best for American interests. I never heard him say anything which in my interpretation of the word would be regarded as a bias toward the Chinese Communists. I think that his comments were made as objectively as he knew how to make them, and in that sense I don't see how he could be regarded as pro-Communist.

Q. Do you know who Bishop Paul Yu-pin is, Mr. Davies?—A. I know who he is. I don't know him.

Q. You don't?—A. I am not acquainted with him.

Q. Do you know what his relationship was in 1945 to the Kuomintang, if he had any relation to it?—A. As I recall it, it was a very close relationship with the Chinese Government officials and the Kuomintang. I couldn't go into it any deeper than that because my memory on that question is not detailed.

Q. It has been charged by Bishop Paul Yu-pin, as well as by others including Congressman Dondero and Senator McCarthy, that Mr. Service in effect kept hammering at General Stilwell to force General Stilwell to make demands on Chiang Kai-shek to arm the Communist Party, the Chinese Communist Party forces. Can you tell the board just how close a personal relationship Mr. Service had with General Stilwell?—A. General Stilwell had very few personal intimates. He took very few people into his confidence, including his intimates. His habit was to listen and to make up his own mind, and one was not always certain what his own conclusions were as a result of one's own comments. As for Mr. Service and his relationship with General Stilwell, I believe that General Stilwell had a feeling of considerable friendship for Mr. Service but obviously he regarded Mr. Service as a junior officer whose views he would listen to, take under consideration, but General Stilwell always made up his own mind as to what he was going to do.

Q. During the period Mr. Service was attached to General Stilwell's staff, Mr. Service was first in Chungking from August of 1943 until about July 1944—is that approximately correct according to your recollection?—A. According to my recollection; yes.

Q. And then at that time he went to Yenan with the observer mission, did he not?—A. Yes.

Q. And was there until October 1944 when General Stilwell was recalled, is that correct?—A. As I recall it.

Q. During that period, did Mr. Service have frequent opportunity for personal contact with General Stilwell?—A. I was not in Chungking at the time, so I can't answer it except as I knew from what Mr. Service had told me, which was that it was not frequent.

Q. As a matter of fact, was General Stilwell in Chungking very much?—A. General Stilwell was—he went to Chungking always reluctantly and left always as soon as he could. I don't recall whether General Stilwell was there—

Q. I am talking roughly now about the period August 1943 until roughly the—well, the year from the middle of 1943 to the middle of 1944.—A. You are being very subtle with me now! Wasn't he in Burma then? I have forgotten.

Q. My impression is that he was engaged in fighting somewhere but I don't recall.—A. Yes. I imagine he was in the depths of the Burma campaign. Is that—

Q. My impression has been that he was largely engaged during that period in actual military operations elsewhere.—A. Yes.



The CHAIRMAN. Is that your impression?

A. Yes. I don't recall definitely; but yes, when the Burma campaign was going on—and that was in late 1943, I believe, and early 1944, and that is the period you are covering, isn't it?

Q. Yes.—A. The great complaint was that General Stilwell was down in the mud in Burma all the time, instead of up in his headquarters in Chungking. When he was in Chungking, as I said, he kept very much to himself. When one saw him, he listened, made his own decisions, but he was a man who operated and lived quite a lonely life with very few intimates. I would not consider Mr. Service as one of General Stilwell's real intimates.

Q. Now, during the period from July, end of July 1944 until October 19, 1944, which is when General Stilwell was recalled, Mr. Service was in Yen-an. Was General Stilwell, as far as you know, ever in Yen-an during this period?—A. No, he was not in Yen-an during this period.

Q. So that any attempts by Mr. Service to influence General Stilwell would have had to have been largely through the written reports that he prepared, is that correct?—A. That is correct.

Q. Are you familiar with—as I understand, all of the reports which Mr. Service prepared, copies of all reports which Mr. Service prepared were sent to you, is that correct?—A. That is right.

Q. Do you have any knowledge of Mr. Service's insistence in any of these reports to General Stilwell that General Stilwell make demands on Chiang Kai-shek to arm some 300,000 Communist troops?—A. I do not recall any such recommendation. Certainly there would be no insistence or importunities on the part of a junior reporting officer to a theater commander.

Q. Bishop Paul Yu-pin is reported to have said that Mr. Service made at least three such insistent demands, kept coming back at General Stilwell, and finally caused General Stilwell to go to Chiang Kai-shek and make these demands on Chiang, and that thereafter Chiang requested President Roosevelt to recall General Stilwell. Does that accord with either your understanding of the circumstances under which General Stilwell was recalled or is it consistent with any activities of Mr. Service that you knew about?—A. On the basis of my information, that is a ridiculous charge. General Stilwell, I might add, had been trying to obtain control over Chinese troops since 1942. That was the beginning of his attempts to get control over the Chinese armies because he had very little confidence in the Chinese generals with whom he was associated and he felt that there was no discipline in the higher echelons of the Chinese Army and that the only way the Chinese fighting forces could be made effective was to have them brought under American control. That was irrespective of what political stripe the Chinese troops might be, whether they were Central Government troops, provincial troops, dissident troops in the southeast, or Communist troops.

Q. Referring back to your testimony for a few moments ago about General Stilwell's personal relations with his associates, whom would you regard as possibly the person who was on most intimate personal terms with General Stilwell, in terms of his associates around him?—A. I should think General—now Colonel—Frank Dorn, who had been an assistant military attaché with General Stilwell in 1938, who was a China language officer from the Army, who had been General Stilwell's aide when General Stilwell first went out to China after Pearl Harbor, and who was later in command of the operations on the Salween River operating from Yunnan Province.

Q. Referring to Document No. 33-6, a newspaper reporter by the name of Ray Richards has stated, Mr. Davies, that Mr. Service allegedly made a special mission to Moscow, roughly in the summer of 1944; to aid the Red group of the United States Embassy there in weakening the will of Chiang Kai-shek not to submit to North China Communist demands. Do you know whether Mr. Service was ever in Moscow?—A. He was not. He was never in Moscow.

Q. And you have personal knowledge that he could not have been there during the year 1944?—A. I do.

Mr. ACHILLES. From the contents that looks like a journalistic slip, it is intended to be Chungking rather than Moscow.

Q. I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any? (None.)

Thank you very much.

Mr. DAVIES. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been very helpful.

(The witness was dismissed, the board adjourned for a short recess and reconvened.)

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. RHETTS. At this point I should like to introduce into the transcript Document No. 46, which is an affidavit of Arthur W. Grafton, consisting of 12 pages, dated April 24, 1950. May that be included in the transcript?

The CHAIRMAN. That may be included in the transcript.  
(The material referred to is as follows:)

## DOCUMENT No. 46

## AFFIDAVIT OF ARTHUR W. GRAFTON

STATE OF KENTUCKY,

*County of Jefferson, ss:*

Arthur W. Grafton, being first duly sworn according to law, states upon his oath as follows:

I am a practicing lawyer of Louisville, Kentucky. I was born in 1907 at Hsuehoufu, China. My father, the Reverend Thomas B. Grafton, was a native of Mississippi, and my mother, Lettie Taylor Grafton, was a native of Louisville, Kentucky. Except for a year in America when I was five and another year when I was twelve, in the course of my parents' sabbatical furloughs to the United States, I spent the first seventeen years of my life in China. For four school years (1919-1920, 1921-1924) I attended high school in the Shanghai American School, my parents at that time being stationed at Haichow, Kiangsu Province. During the course of my years in China I became well acquainted with John Stewart Service, who was likewise a missionary's son and went to Shanghai to school.

In 1924 I returned to the United States and for four years attended Presbyterian College of South Carolina, Clinton, South Carolina, from which I graduated in 1928. In that year I came to Louisville, attending Jefferson School of Law from which I graduated in 1930. I have been continuously engaged in the practice here since my admission to the Bar in the fall of 1930, except for a short period from January to June, 1942, when I was counsel for the Defense Plant Corporation in Washington, from June 1942 to August 1945 when I was on active duty with the Army Air Forces, and from August 1945 until December 1945 again with Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington.

In June 1942 I was commissioned a First Lieutenant in the Army Air Forces, went to the Air Forces Intelligence School at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and beginning about the first of July 1942, was assigned to the Current Intelligence Section of A-2 of the Headquarters, Army Air Forces in Washington. There I was also assigned to the China-Burma-India Theater of operations, with the primary duty of keeping the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, and his Washington staff informed daily as to significant developments in the CBI Theater. I remained at this station until March of 1943. At that time I proceeded under order to New Delhi, India, where I was assigned to the Rear Echelon Headquarters of the Commanding General, CBI Theater (General Stilwell) and placed in the G-3 Section under then Colonel later General Frank A. Merrill. Late in June of 1943 I was transferred to Kunming, China, where I was Assistant G-3 in the headquarters of the Commanding General of what was known as the Y Forces Operations Staff (YFOS), commanded by Colonel later Brigadier General Frank A. Dorn. November 25, 1943, I was transferred back to Delhi, and assigned in the Intelligence Section of the newly established headquarters of the Commanding General for the Army Air Forces in the India-Burma sector of the CBI Theater (General George E. Stratemeyer). In March of 1944 I moved with his headquarters to Hastings Mill outside of Calcutta where I remained stationed until sent home on furlough in April of 1945. My orders to return to General Stratemeyer's headquarters at the conclusion of leave were cancelled and superseded while I was in the United States due to V-E Day intervening, and I remained unassigned until shortly after VJ-Day in August when I was relieved from active duty.

During my entire tour of duty in Washington, India, and China, I was charged with the responsibility of keeping informed as to the general situation in India, Burma, and China, as such situation affected current military operations. Beginning in Washington in July 1942 I was required to and did study all available current information concerning our own and the enemy's actions in China in order to keep the Commanding General and his staff informed. This included the study of radio and written reports from the military headquarters in the theater, as well as State Department reports reflecting upon political developments. More than any other theater, the CBI Theater was one in which

the political situation played a major role. In 1942 we had no combat troops of our own in China except for a very small Air Force detachment of the 10th Air Force under General Chenault. This force was gradually built up between 1942 and 1945 into the 14th Air Force, but at no time did it constitute a major military force in comparison to our forces in other theaters, and the existence and effectiveness of the 14th Air Force was in large measure wholly dependent upon the cooperation of the Chinese and the ability of the Chinese to provide and protect suitable bases from which the 14th could operate.

Except for the action of the 14th Air Force (severely restricted as to the scope of its operations by the difficulty of supply over the Hump) our forces in China were largely bystanders without the means to influence the outcome of the struggle for the Chinese mainland. The actual fighting with the enemy depended upon the Chinese themselves and General Stilwell's staff was primarily concerned with encouragements and advice to the Chinese and such supplies as could be gradually built up over the Hump. The Chinese effort or really lack of effort was in turn dictated almost entirely by political considerations, and an understanding of at least the major forces in the political background was an absolute essential to any sort of study of the military problems we were considering. In fact, the more one studied and learned about the political forces at work, the more it became apparent that events in China were going to be dictated by political rather than military moves. Increasingly, therefore, it became necessary for me to devote time and attention to the political reports which came to us principally through the Embassy in Chungking and through General Stilwell's political advisers who were in turn members of the Embassy Staff detached to him for that purpose.

From the military intelligence standpoint, evaluation of the information coming out of China was impossible without an understanding of the political situation. In the first place, we had very few primary sources of intelligence of our own. Detailed information as to the enemy Order of Battle, both Air and Ground, their capabilities and intentions, originated almost wholly from Chinese sources and was traditionally edited and colored for the purpose of further political ends. We knew from experience that most of this information was fed to us not for the purpose of informing us as to the facts, but for the purpose of influencing particular attitudes or actions on the part of the Americans. The daily communiques issued by the Chinese Ministry of Information at Chungking were almost wholly fictional and fanciful and were never given any substantial credence by our Intelligence Staff. To a lesser degree, official intelligence reports made to us through Chinese Army channels were likewise suspect and had to be weighed against the known political objectives.

When I got to India in March of 1943 I was delighted to learn that Jack Service and John Davies were acting as political advisers to General Stilwell. I had known John Davies like Jack Service in China as a boy, and I knew them both to have an exceptionally broad understanding of Chinese thinking and politics. Knowing them personally, and particularly knowing their background in China, I felt that they could be of tremendous help in the job of sifting the wheat from the chaff in the intelligence reports which were emanating from Chinese sources. I read every report which came into our headquarters from these two men during my entire tour of duty in the theater.

In the spring of 1943 Davies was primarily stationed in Delhi and Service was in China. Service's reports came through the office of General Stilwell's G-2 in Chungking, who I believe at that time was Colonel Dickey. I am sure that Colonel Dickey was the G-2 later in 1943 and during 1944.

In June of 1943 when I reported to General Dorn's staff, I found our problem more than ever tied to and dependent upon the Chinese political situation. The YFOS was a headquarters set up by General Stilwell in Kunming for the purpose of directing the operations of an Infantry training school and an Artillery training school in the Kunming area, where, according to plan, some fifteen divisions of Chinese troops were to be trained and equipped to combat efficiency. In addition, this staff was charged with the duty of preparation of a plan, in collaboration with the Chinese military headquarters in Kunming, for an ultimate launching of an attack on Burma from the Chinese side with a view of making a juncture with the X Forces, which was a name assigned to the Chinese divisions being trained in India, and which were designed to and ultimately did attack the Japanese in northern Burma through the Ledo Road.

After the establishment of the Infantry and Artillery schools, it was the duty of YFOS to negotiate with the Chinese concerning which troops were to be trained

and equipped and to make estimates as to the progress of the training and the combat capabilities of the troops as trained.

The Chinese army then, as now, varied widely in quality as between divisions and armies, being largely the reflection of the personality, ambitions, and political power of their commanders. We obviously wanted to get the best divisions possible assigned for this training, but were constantly faced with the fact that political considerations in China dictated what troops were made available and when.

The determination of which divisions we would try to get for training and the estimate as to whether or not particular troops would be assigned was largely a question of understanding Chinese politics. Repeatedly we were promised that particular divisions would be moved into the training area and repeatedly these promises were broken or countermanded. The best troops, according to our information, were largely immobilized in northwest China facing the Communists and were not made available either for training for eventual combat in Burma or even for the important task of guarding the forward fields of the 14th Air Force from possible enemy ground action. The units that actually were assigned for training were far below these troops in numbers, physical condition, equipment, and morale, and as a result the target date for the beginning of actual operations from the China side was repeatedly postponed. It was one long frustration and in the end the attack which had been originally planned for early 1944 only materialized in 1945 and contributed but little to the reconquest of northern Burma.

While I was in Kunming, Jack Service was there on at least two occasions. The first, to the best of my recollection, was in July, and on that occasion he and I renewed our boyhood acquaintance and discussed the military and political situation in China at considerable length. Jack at that date had spent considerable time in northwest China in the general area where the Nationalist armies were engaged in containing the Communists, and personally knew a great deal about the strength and disposition of the Nationalist forces there. I had previously noted his reports on this subject and was glad to get from him first-hand information as to general conditions in that part of China. He was also able to give me some highly useful information as to the nature and position of the various Chinese political parties then engaged in the constant struggle for power within the Nationalist Government, and filled me in on the personalities of a great many of Chinese political and military figures whose names appeared in the many reports which I was studying.

Another occasion in Kunming when I had a chance to talk with Jack at length was in November 1943, just prior to my return to India.

I did not thereafter have contact with Jack until in April of 1945 when I was returning home on leave. At that time he was likewise returning to Washington to make a report on the situation in China, and he and I traveled in the same plane from Calcutta as far as Casablanca. In the three days we were together then he told me about his recent visit to Yenan and what he had learned of the Chinese Communists first-hand and his general impression, most of which had already been embodied in a series of reports which had come to me through Colonel Dickey's office in Chungking. Some of these reports have since been published, excerpts at least appearing in the State Department publications concerning our relations with China.

During all these times both in the consideration and study of the reports which Service prepared and in the personal conversations and consultations with him, I never had any reason to doubt nor do I now doubt his complete loyalty to the United States. In the face of the almost complete frustration to which we were all subjected by reason of the tactics of the Chinese Government, it was probably impossible for anyone to remain completely objective in reporting on the Chinese, but within this general limitation, I felt that Jack's reporting was the kind of objective, accurate, and searching analysis of the existing situation that was most sorely needed. I have had but little opportunity to check on the accuracy of the details contained in these reports, but the correctness of his over-all estimates of the situation was repeatedly borne out by the day-to-day events. Particularly it seems that his long-range predictions as to the course of political affairs in China were startlingly accurate, especially when considered in the light of the apparent capabilities of the Nationalist forces and the apparent weakness and geographical isolation of the Communists.

In none of the many conversations with Jack did I detect any indication of personal Communist leanings on his part, or any indication of sympathy with the aims of Soviet Russia and world communism. He expressed the conviction that

the Chinese Communist had found a way to gain and hold mass support from the people. We at the same time had prepared an intelligence estimate to the effect that the Japanese could at will overrun our forward airfields in China. If his opinion was pro-Communist, then ours was pro-Japanese. Events shortly demonstrated that both estimates were accurate. In my judgment Jack's reports were nothing more nor less than objective conclusions on a subject vital to every phase of our effort in China based upon first-hand observation by a man singularly well trained by background and experience to understand the reactions and probable attitudes of the Chinese people.

Such reporting was in my judgment invaluable. If we needed or could have used intelligence reports tinged with wishful thinking and ostrichlike ignoring of the basic facts, we were abundantly supplied with them through both Chinese military and political sources on the Nationalist side.

Since charges have been leveled at Jack Service based in part at least upon his reports on China, I have reread such of the reports as I could locate, and I am still unable to detect in them anything which would remotely justify the slightest suspicion that Jack was doing any more than the job that was expected of him by the Commanding General to whom he was attached, and that was to ascertain the facts, interpret them in the light of his broad Chinese experience, and express whatever conclusions resulted therefrom. The only thing to be regretted is that we did not have more men doing as good a job as Jack did, and that his reports and those of the few who saw as clearly as he did were not given more serious consideration in the making of our over-all plans for Asia.

I understand that there is some criticism or suspicion directed at Jack because certain of his political information was disclosed to and known by the press both through correspondents accredited to the theater and through reporters and editors located in this country. Without knowing what particular information is thought to have been wrongfully disclosed, I do think it important that people generally realize that in most operating theaters, according to my understanding, and in the CBI Theater, according to my personal experience, there was a very wide range of disclosure to the accredited correspondents of the American press of the type of information that for general security purposes was classified all the way from Restricted to Top Secret. The policy of keeping the press representatives thoroughly briefed was one initiated from the very top. The fact that the CBI Theater was, as heretofore stated, as much influenced by local politics as by enemy action, made it apparent to the respective officers in charge that political background was an essential to an understanding by the American press and people of the manifold difficulties confronting military operations. The representatives of the press in the theater were, with but few exceptions, men of understanding, capacity, and discretion, and in many instances were as well informed or better informed through their own sources than the military headquarters which they visited. There was a constant interchange of information along these lines which was helpful to a high degree. Not only, therefore, was there a general understanding that the accredited American correspondents were to be taken into our confidence in regard to most of our military operations, but we were permitted to discuss freely with them our information and personal ideas as to the political situation. On more than one occasion I was specifically directed by my superior officers to brief correspondents on matters which came to my knowledge through classified documents, and nearly all of the political reports to which I have referred were classified either Confidential or Secret.

The political advisers to General Stilwell were naturally the best sources for this type of information for the correspondents, and it was only natural that they tended to discuss these matters at length. Not only was it well known that such discussions took place, but I am under the impression that they were encouraged by the commanding officers involved. I certainly never heard anyone criticized or reprimanded for frank discussions with American correspondents.

So far as I can recall there were but two military subjects which were beyond the range of permissible discussion. One was anything relating to plans for future military operations and the other was any discussion of the intelligence gained from radio intercepts. These two subjects, however, were restricted within the ranks of military personnel themselves, and even in General Arnold's War Room in Washington, where admittance was only to the highest ranking Air Force officers, these two subjects were never discussed or hinted at.

I would be very much surprised to find that there was any substantial amount of information contained in the political reports which I received that was not well known by at least a half a dozen of the better-informed correspondents.

for the American press who were operating in China and India during the times that the reports were current.

Dated at Louisville, Kentucky, this 24 day of April 1950.

(S) Arthur W. Grafton,  
ARTHUR W. GRAFTON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and County aforesaid, by Arthur W. Grafton, to me personally known, this the 24 day of April 1950.

My commission expires December 19, 1951.

(S) LILLIAN FLEISCHER,  
Notary Public, Jefferson County, Kentucky.

Mr. RHETTS. Now I would like to offer document No. 47, which is the text of a communication from Col. David D. Barrett, assistant military attache, at Taipei, Formosa, to John S. Service, dated April 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be included in the record, in the transcript.  
(The matter referred to as follows:)

DOCUMENT No. 47

TEXT OF COMMUNICATION FROM COL. DAVID D. BARRETT, ASSISTANT ATTACHÉ AT  
TAIPEI, FORMOSA, TO JOHN S. SERVICE, APRIL 1950

"Over 1 year ago at request of Department of State I made detailed report on subject of your radio and my letter should be on file. During period we served in Yen-an your views and recommendations on subject of Chinese Communists were set forth in reports submitted through official channels and I believe these should be carefully considered in connection with any investigation of your loyalty. In my opinion, these reports indicated that you, like myself and some others serving in China at that time, were deceived to some extent by Chinese Communist advocacy of agrarian reform, by careful soft-pedaling of their adherence to Marxian doctrine, by ardent professions of support of democratic ideals and undying friendship for the United States, and by other plays intended to gain United States support. I never saw in these reports any signs of disloyalty or desire to hurt the United States. In our discussions of Chinese Communists while we were in Yen-an our primary consideration was part they could play in fighting common enemy and I do not believe any idea of helping communism as such ever occurred to you any more than it did to me. Seems to me essential to bear in mind that Chinese Communists and Soviet Union and other nations and groups then fighting on our side presented much different picture than from what they do today. In my association with you in Yen-an and elsewhere in China theater I always considered you highly security-conscious and intensely loyal to your country. As for charges you passed secret documents to unauthorized persons anywhere it would require more convincing proof than has apparently ever been presented to agencies hitherto investigating you to make me believe them. Above included in written affidavit which follows by pouch."

(Mr. Robert W. Barnett, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

Questions by Mr. RHETTS:

Q. Will you state your full name and address, please, sir?—A. Robert Warren Barnett, 4225 Forty-ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Q. Are you acquainted with Mr. John Service, Mr. Barnett?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you describe when you first met him and the nature of your association with him since that time?

The CHAIRMAN. Before you do that why don't you qualify Mr. Barnett? Just state what he is doing.

Q. What is your present position, Mr. Barnett?—A. Mr. Chairman, I am now an employee of the Department of State. I am assigned to the Office of China Affairs, where I have the title of Officer in Charge of Economic Affairs. I have been working in the Department of State since the fall of 1945, and until my assignment to the Office of China Affairs I was in the economic part of the Department working primarily on Japanese questions.

Q. And you came with the Department in the fall of 1945?—A. That is right.

Q. What were you doing prior to that time?—A. I was in the Department of the Army, the War Department, immediately prior to coming to the State Department.

Q. In what capacity?—A. I was in the Military Intelligence Service of G-2, and I had been assigned there in May of 1945. Prior to that time I had been on the staff of General Chenault in China for some 22 months, where I was the assistant A-2 in charge of all combat intelligence for the Fourteenth Air Force Headquarters. Prior to then I was in Army schools in this country.

Q. Now, I believe you have stated that you were acquainted with Mr. Service. Would you tell the Board when you first met him and describe your association with him since that time?—A. My father happens to be the general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association in this country, and prior to that he was the head of the YMCA in China. Mr. Service's father was a secretary of the YMCA, too. Our families were intimately acquainted with each other for many years. The Services were stationed in Szechwan and my family lived in east China in Hungchow and Shanghai. In 1922 I entered the Shanghai American School, which was an American institution and mainly supported by the missionaries throughout China that wanted an American school to which to send their children, and also supported by the business community and some of the official American community in China. Sometime following 1922, I think it must have been about 1925, the Service boys—there were several of them—started coming to Shanghai, and I first became acquainted with Jack in Shanghai in the mid or late twenties. I forget exactly what year it was. Jack was 2 or 3 years ahead of me in high school and grammar school. He was active in the Boy Scouts and various campus activities, and we got to know each other quite well, but not terribly intimately at that time. Jack went away to college and so did I, and our paths did not really cross in such a way that we could get acquainted with each other well until 1940, when Jack was assigned to the consulate general in Shanghai and I was in Shanghai writing a book on Shanghai under the joint sponsorship of the Rockefeller Foundation and the Institute of Pacific Relations.

My book was to be a part of the so-called inquiry series and was published in 1941. Jack was on Consul General Lockhart's staff and I saw a good deal of him socially. I didn't see too much of him in connection with my research because Jack's interests were not primarily economic and my connections with the consulate were primarily with Bland Calder and some of his Chinese assistants. The consulate general's staff was very cooperative in assisting me to make contact with members of the British and American and the Japanese business community and also in providing me with statistical and factual information which would have been quite difficult for me to have compiled myself in the short period that I was in Shanghai.

Jack was at that time hoping to be assigned to west China, and the next time I saw him was in 1942 when I was sent out by United China Relief to do an economic survey of China. The survey was intended to assist United China Relief in developing a program of relief for free China after the Burma Road had been lost. Jack was very helpful to me at that time in making contacts with members of the Chinese Cabinet people, like Wang Chung Hui—I believe he was Foreign Minister at the time—T. F. Chiang, Madame Chiang Kai-Shek, the Kungs—in fact, the whole range of people in Chungking who were anxious to establish an effective working arrangement with the people in this country who were interested in going on supplying relief to the Chinese.

As you know, United China Relief was supported primarily by existing relief agencies but had been brought together through the active intervention of Mr. Henry Luce, who was the principal angel of the enterprise, coming in with financial assistance in a magnitude that would make it worth while for the agencies to work together rather than to work separately. My trip to China that time was a brief one. I was there only six weeks.

The next time I saw Jack was in the fall of 1943, when I had been assigned to General Chenault's headquarters, and Jack, I believe, had just been assigned to General Stilwell's headquarters, and we of course were very glad to see each other for personal reasons, but since his functions were largely in the political sphere and mine were exclusively in the military sphere, we did not have continuous or very close connections with each other during the war. In fact, I left Kunming during my 22 months' assignment out there only once prior to preparing to leave the theater. It was in early March that I had occasion to go to Chungking, and while in Chungking I saw Jack, together with a great many of my other friends there.

The occasion for my going, if you wish me to just continue in this manner—

Q. Go right ahead.—A. The occasion for my going was to obtain theater clearance for a manuscript which I had prepared at the request of General Chennault and General Glenn. This manuscript was entitled, "An Orientation Booklet for United States Military Personnel in China." It was written at a time when we thought that the war might last another year or two and it was intended for use by officers and noncommissioned officers already in the theater or who were expected to arrive in the theater. The Burma Road had quite recently been opened and we expected a huge expansion of American personnel in China. For some 15 to 18 months it had been one of my functions at the Fourteenth Air Force Headquarters to give daily briefings to General Chennault and weekly briefings on the military and economic and political situation in China to all transient personnel passing through Kunming who had any right to this kind of information. We had generals coming in and we had Intelligence sergeants coming in on Friday mornings, map room, and so on, so it was not very much of a trick for me to put in the manuscript what I knew to be the answers to the questions which this type of officer had on his mind.

I am sorry I don't have a copy of the book with me, but it breaks down into some 12 to 14 chapters something on the historical background of the war, organization of the Japanese Army, the organization of our own forces, the economics of the war, the combat record, our own combat record, the history of the campaigns that the Japanese had fought, some comment on the place of the China war and the Pacific war, and I had written a chapter on the Chinese political situation which I knew had to be handled discreetly, because although the booklet was classified "Restricted" we intended to print 10,000 copies of the booklet and it was quite certain that at least 1 copy would fall into the hands of the Chinese.

I chose to write this political chapter in such terms that neither the Kuomintang Party leaders nor the Chinese Communist Party leaders could find offense in it. That was a hard thing to do, but I thought it was a possible thing to do, because at that time both parties argued that they stood on the principles of the San Min Chu I of the Sun Yat Sen, so I described Sun Yat Sen's position in Chinese history, the development of the Kuomintang, an explanation of the way they applied the political doctrines of Sun Yat Sen to the China situation, and then concluded with a section on how the Chinese Communists had interpreted the same principles as their body of doctrine.

This manuscript was cleared by the Fourteenth Air Force Headquarters, the A-2 Colonel Williams, and the Chief of Staff General Glenn, it had been read by other members of the headquarters: Hank Byroade, for instance, was in headquarters at that time. I went to Chungking to clear this manuscript and it was read there by the G-2 Colonel Dickey, members of the G-2 staff, and other general headquarters staff officers, and generally cleared through all of these people with a few revisions and amendments, but it was felt that the political adviser to General Stilwell's headquarters should have a crack at it and approve it if possible, and that was Jack, so I had a professional reason for calling on Jack. I let him see the manuscript and he kept it a couple of days and he returned it to Colonel Dickey with a recommendation that this political chapter be deleted from the book on the grounds that whereas it was a fair and fairly innocuous treatment of the problem of the Kuomintang-Communist ideological friction, the Kuomintang would find offensive any Government publication which recognized the existence of the Communists. Now that was unquestionably the case, and I had not thought of that. Actually a few weeks later the theater headquarters under General Wedemeyer brought out a directive which prohibited the discussion of any political issues at all by military personnel in China. With that amendment in the manuscript, the manuscript was cleared, I brought it back and it was published. I would be glad to give you a copy at some time.

Q. I don't think that will be necessary.

(Off-record discussion.)

Q. Now, based on your knowledge of and acquaintance and association with Mr. Service, and apart from the instance that you have just given concerning his acute sensitivity to avoid political friction between the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communists, would you be able to express an opinion to the Board as to whether Mr. Service has ever to your knowledge expressed any views or in any other way conducted himself so as to indicate that he was a Communist or a Communist sympathizer?—A. To my knowledge Jack has never done or said anything which would lead me to think that he was either a Communist or



We made the further distribution of it other than plane mail going back and forth.

Q. Now, when was it that General Wedemeyer appeared on the scene?—A. Well, it was the end of October, or the first of November, just a matter of days in there.

Q. Did you have the responsibility for briefing him when he arrived with regard to things that had happened prior?—A. That's right.

Q. Do you know what of Mr. Service's materials were specifically called to his attention? Can you remember anything or would you have given him a composite report which would have contained materials possibly reflecting Mr. Service's comments?—A. No, sir; I can't remember specifically. As I said, Mr. Service's reports after they were circulated in our headquarters came back and I used to have them in a file there which I imagine I gave him to read, but I can't state that definitely. I did, of course, do a good deal of verbal briefing.

Q. Yes. Do you know much of Mr. Service's association with General Wedemeyer during the short while that they were together, that they were in the same theater?—A. No; I don't. He didn't have too much chance to see General Wedemeyer during that period that General Wedemeyer came to our headquarters, as Mr. Service was in Yenan most of the time.

Q. I see. Did you know of Mr. Service's relations with the American press during this period in Yenan? Were you any way involved in his relationships, in briefing sessions or anything else with the American press?—A. Not in Yenan I wouldn't have been; no.

Q. That wouldn't have been—

A. No, that would have been done by Colonel Barrett who was on the spot.

Q. I see. I have no more questions.

Questions by the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Did you have a relationship with respect to the briefing of correspondents at any other place than Yenan?—A. No, no briefing with relationship to them. I remember after they came back there was some flurry where they wanted to get back to the States rather quickly and I refused them passage.

Q. What I was referring to was the liberty that the correspondents had or that the political reporters had to discuss what they had observed with correspondents, were you familiar with that?—A. No. We took a rather careful position there that anything regarding China was a matter for the Chinese to censor, that we were not going to be placed in the position of censoring Chinese news by our own reporters because we took one definite stand: If it had military implications or violated military security we took out the material that they had. If it concerned Chinese politics and things like that, had we not had the Chinese censorship available we would have censored, that's true, as allies, but since they were, in turn, censored we took the stand: You do the censoring of what you consider objectionable, we will not.

Q. How would the Chinese go about censoring a conversation or a briefing session between, say, a political reporter like Mr. Service and the American correspondents still on the staff, connected with the staff?—A. Well, they wouldn't have had any opportunity to sit in on that. A briefing could have been a conversation.

Q. Yes.—A. But it was the writings, everything was written, every dispatch had to go through Chinese censorship.

Q. That is, dispatched to the home papers?—A. That's right, sir, anything that was to go out for dispatch.

Questions by Mr. SERVICE:

Q. Just as any mail the correspondents might wish to send back was also subject to Chinese censorship if it went through open channels?—A. If it went through open channels, if it went back through our couriers it was not subject to Chinese censorship.

Q. Subject to yours?—A. Subject to ours.

Questions by Mr. STEVENS:

Q. Was there objection on your part to a political reporter like Mr. Service giving background information in a briefing session to American correspondents orally on Chinese matters, not military matters?—A. No, not at all.

Q. Was he expected to do that sort of thing?—A. I don't know if it was actually assigned as part of his duties, certainly there was no objection interposed.

## Questions by Mr. ACHILLES:

Q. Colonel, you have read Document 193, which is Mr. Service's Report No. 40 of October 10, 1944?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Service has stated that he ascertained later that General Stilwell had prior to the date of that report transmitted substantially the same recommendations to Washington. Do you recall from your own knowledge whether General Stilwell had expressed similar views?—A. You place me in a hard position, Mr. Achilles; I lived with General Stilwell. In other words, a good deal of things were said at the table. What was said in messages and what was said in table conversations is a little bit hard—

Q. I was referring to his official reports.—A. Most of his official reports I never read. They were his "eyes alone" message, as back here, and "eyes alone" we were not circulated, of course.

Q. They went as "eyes alone"? On pages 68 and 69 of the white paper are given extracts from certain messages from General Stilwell in September 1940; do you have that?—A. I have it; yes, sir.

Q. Could you state from your knowledge whether those represented General Stilwell's views, personal views at that time or the views of his staff as a whole?—A. I would say that they were General Stilwell's personal viewpoint. This reads like him. General Stilwell did not make use—in other words, a staff paper being drawn up and then revamping it and then sending it, he wrote his own material. And you see he came there early in September and remained there until he was sent home working on this type of thing by himself with General Bergin, and General Merrill came up there, but they actually worked in the general's quarters, and we, of course, were down at headquarters. This was, of course, a separate thing from our normal activity. This reads like the general himself; undoubtedly, he wrote this himself, I would say.

Q. You would say that was the general's statement himself rather than reflecting Mr. Service or his staff, that was the general's statement himself?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. You have stated that as G-2 you were responsible for the security of the intelligence material in the headquarters at Yenan.—A. Well, of anything classified, our counterintelligence, you see, is responsible for.

Q. While you were G-2 in Chungking do you recall any cases of violation or alleged violation of security with respect to material furnished by Mr. Service?—A. No; I can't think of any. There was an occasion after the war was all over—no, right after General Stilwell had left when we had some people there writing up the history now of the history during General Stilwell's time, during which a man lost a notebook which could have contained some of Mr. Service's material, as the fellow had made extracts from all of the different things available, and he lost that on the street.

Q. Was that an official, or a newspaperman?—A. It was an official, one of our officers, but he had it in a musette bag. He was all through and yet he lost his notes. He was sent home in a great hurry, rather harsh disciplinary action taken.

Q. In your capacity as G-2 did you have any view of the public relations director?—A. Yes, I did in Chungking during General Stilwell's time in office there. Public relations were actually a branch of my own office. In other words, I had people there who handled it and I consequently, had knowledge of policy and, in general, what was going on. I usually received a general briefing; under General Wedemeyer we made it a separate office.

Q. Your public relations activities were also under your responsibility as security officer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were there any cases while you were there of alleged improper briefing by Mr. Service of any correspondents or persons?—A. I don't quite get your implication, Mr. Achilles, of improper briefings.

Q. That is, the improper disclosure of classified information to correspondents or others?—A. No, I can't remember anything like that. You oftentimes take a correspondent quite a bit into the bosom of the family so that he is able to write more intelligently. I refer, for instance, to reporters coming and asking: "Is this a good time to leave Chungking? Are things going to be quiet here? Is it safe to go down to the front? Is trouble going to break out in this spot or this spot?" Now, that is highly classified, and yet you will tell them: "If I were you, I would go to this spot." You have got to move them to the spots where things are happening. It is highly classified, no doubt about it, but you tell them.

Q. I have nothing further.

The CHAIRMAN. We will take a short recess.

## Questions by the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Now, Mr. Service, I want to turn to another occasion. This has reference to a meeting between you and Mr. Jaffe on May 29, 1945. On this occasion it is stated that Mr. Jaffe informed you that Kate Mitchell was writing a book for which the publisher had suggested the title "China Without Confucius." It is stated that you told Mr. Jaffe that you yourself had written a report on the setting up of the Confucian Society in China and that you asked Mr. Jaffe if he had ever seen this report of yours. Do you remember such a conversation, Mr. Service?—A. I remember such a conversation; yes, sir.

Q. What report would that be? Is that one of your reports that we have before this board?—A. No, sir; because it would have been a report, I assume, written while I was in the Embassy attached directly to the Embassy. It would have been a dispatch for the Ambassador's signature, of which—of course, as I have testified before—I never retained any copies. I believe that that Confucian Society was established in 1941 or early 1942. And we made no effort to have the State Department assemble all of those early dispatches which I drafted for the Ambassador's signature while I was in the Embassy.

Q. Why would you have assumed that Jaffe would have seen such a report?—A. Perhaps I didn't hear your question.

Q. I said that, at the end of my question, you asked Mr. Jaffe if he ever saw your report on the matter.—A. I'm sorry; I didn't hear that.

Q. Why would you have asked him that question if, as a matter of fact, the report was one which you yourself had never seen which was made by the Ambassador?—A. Well, of course I had seen it since I drafted it, but I don't remember asking Mr. Jaffe whether or not he had seen it. I don't understand that statement.

Q. Did you have any basis for assuming that Jaffe had seen any of your reports previous to the time of your meeting?—A. Yes, I had some basis to believe that some types of material were being made available; the information in some types of reports were being made available to writers here. I mentioned earlier the fact that it seemed to me that Mr. Gayn had certainly had a chance to read my memorandum of June 20, since there was similarity between his article in Collier's and some of the things that had been said in that report.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Service, did you at that time have any knowledge of the fact that Mr. Jaffe had in his possession United States Government documents?

A. No, sir; I did not. I'm not sure whether I made myself clear. My feeling, my assumption, was that a good deal of background information was being made known to writers generally. I had no reason to assume or believe that Jaffe had any copies of any documents.

Q. Or any more information than was being made generally available to other writers?—A. That is correct; yes. A great deal of the writing on China by magazine writers and other people in the United States had to be and was obviously based on information which they could not obtain directly since they were not in China, which I assume was made available to them in one form or another as was the policy at that time.

## Questions by Mr. ACHILLES:

Q. Hadn't Jaffe told you on at least one occasion that he had obtained a copy of one of your reports and given it to Gayn?—A. I can't recall any such statement at the moment. Can you give me more information on it, sir?

Q. I believe it was the report which had been prepared in connection with Mr. Wallace's visit to China and Mr. Jaffe is stated to have told you that the report had been passed around at the Institute of Pacific Relations conference and that he had obtained a copy of it and had given it to Gayn. Do you recall him ever telling you that?—A. I think that may be true. I do have a hazy recollection now of my surprise that this thing had been passed around and I think you're right, sir, that I did hear that it had been passed around at the IPR Conference which I think was held down at White Sulphur Springs, or some place like that. I'm not sure, but I had forgotten all about that, but I think I did hear that this report had been passed around.

The CHAIRMAN. To go on with this statement, it is stated that Mr. Jaffe told you that he had not seen the report and that you told him that, because of your work in writing that report on the Confucian Society, you had gotten an excellent rating from the State Department and that, as a matter of fact, in that work you had made a collection of about 300 slogans used by the society and that you told Mr. Jaffe you would try to dig up the report for him?

A. I think there is a very great condensation and telescoping here. This concerns two entirely separate reports. The report on the Confucian Society, as I recall it—and as I say I haven't seen it since it was drafted back in 1941 or early 1942—was quite a routine report from public sources. The Confucian Society was inaugurated with great publicity and the patrons were H. H. Kung, who was a lineal descendant of Confucius, and Chen Li-Fu, Minister of Education, and a number of other important figures in the Government. And, as I remember, I simply transmitted the published accounts and some of the published material about the objectives and purposes of the organization and made some brief comment.

Q. Was that a classified dispatch?—A. I don't recall.

Questions by the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You said you didn't see the dispatch?—A. No; I drafted the dispatch, sir, but I had no copy of it.

Q. Would you have known whether or not it was classified?—A. Yes. In 1941 and 1942 I was an officer in the Embassy, and was simply drafting it as the political reporting officer. I would have to look up the matter, whether we wrote one unclassified dispatch simply sending in the public material and then wrote another dispatch commenting on it or whether we simply wrote one dispatch with both public information and comment. In any case, as I remember the comment very vaguely, it would not be very highly classified.

Mr. STEVENS. This was in 1941 or 1942?

A. Yes; I think so. Now, the other report, which is apparently referred to here, was a dispatch which I wrote from Lanchow when I was an Embassy observer up there in the summer of 1943. It would be probably June or July 1943. That is a dispatch which, as I say, consisted really of a compilation of these propaganda slogans with some comment on them. The dispatch which I wrote earlier on the Confucian Society was not one I received any commendation on. The one I received the commendation on was the one on wall slogans. This may be an unintelligible phrase.

Newspapers are scarce in China. Movies, radio, other media of propaganda don't reach very many people so that one very common propaganda media is to paint these very large slogans, these large characters, on walls of a building or the wall along a street, or particularly facing a Chinese gateway there is always a wall. The superstition is that evil spirits can only go in a straight line so that opposite any important entrance there is a sort of spirit screen, so that you have to go around the wall to go into the gate and these walls or screens are favorite places for painting a four-character slogan.

I had in my travels all through North China in 1942 and again in 1943 made a practice of jotting down these various slogans, of noting the relative frequency of different slogans, or noting as far as I could the date on which they were painted, because usually down below them there would be in small writing the name of the organization which put it up and the date. So that I was able to trace, I think with some accuracy, the trend of the propaganda line and to note the various organizations which were active in painting the slogans and to some extent the different lines adopted by the different propaganda organizations. As I say, this was a report which I sent in from Lanchow, which was transmitted to the Department by the Embassy and on which I received the rating of excellent. But it is an entirely different one from the one that this material starts talking about.

Questions by the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Was it a classified report?—A. I do not remember, sir. It may have been classified "confidential" or "restricted" because of my comments on the propaganda lines indicated there.

Q. It is stated that you told Mr. Jaffe that it might be sort of hard for you to get this report because it was kept in a section where you were not assigned and where you did not work and that Mr. Jaffe asked you, if you were successful in obtaining the material, to mail it to him in New York or whether you would rather wait until he came to Washington in 2 or 3 weeks and you told Mr. Jaffe, if you could dig up a copy of it, it would be the Far Eastern Division copy and they might not be willing to part with it. But you were sure you would be able to run off a copy for him?—A. I must say that that is very different from my recollection of the conversation. I remember the conversation because I was quite annoyed at Mr. Jaffe and I went into considerable detail to explain to him first why I did not have any copy of my own, any personal copies of these dispatches.

He thought that I would of course have a personal copy. And I explained in considerable detail, as I recall, the difference between an Embassy dispatch which was signed by the Ambassador and the type of memoranda which I had had in my possession, as he knew and which I had allowed him to see some of. I also went into considerable detail why I could not turn them over to him, why I could not remove these from the files and turn them over to him.

My recollection is that I said that I would try to look the dispatch up if I could find it. I pointed out, as I remember it, that that might be difficult because the files in the China Division were quite chaotic and this was a very old dispatch. My recollection is that I told him I would try to look it up and give him the dates of the events, the establishment of the Confucian Society, so that he would have some guide in searching through published materials. It's quite possible that I may also have said that if I found that it was not classified and the Division of Chinese Affairs was willing that it might have been possible for him to see it. But I don't recollect saying that at all.

My chief recollection of the conversation is that my explanation—I remember a rather lengthy explanation as to the difference in character between the Embassy dispatch and the papers I had shown him and the reason why I could not give him copies of the Embassy dispatches. I certainly have no recollection of ever offering to run off a copy for him. I may have said I would copy some of these wall slogans. I told him some wall slogans from memory. I may have said that I would try to copy off some of the more common wall slogans.

Q. Your recollection is in part confirmed by the final statement on this subject that Mr. Jaffe said that it was funny that you did not keep a copy of the report since you had written it and that you said that it was against regulations to keep copies of your reports.—A. I remember considerable discussion and quite a bit of annoyance on my part. This was the first time I think that he ever asked me to obtain copies for him of dispatches.

Q. Now to turn to another subject on the discussion on the same occasion it is stated that you and Mr. Jaffe talked about the "lowdown" on the Hurley story and that Mr. Jaffe told you that Ambassador Gauss told Randall Gould that Gauss resigned because Hurley broke his pledge to Britain by "monkeying" with politics in China.

Mr. RHEETS. Will you read that again, please?

Q. This is a statement that Jaffe is alleged to have told Mr. Service, that Ambassador Gauss had told one Randall Gould that Mr. Gauss had resigned because Mr. Hurley broke his pledge to Britain by "monkeying" around with politics in China and that Mr. Gauss and Mr. Gould never got along well and discussed the possibility of Mr. Gauss giving Mr. Gould some wrong "dope" and that General Stilwell was down in the Pacific and Mr. Jaffe asked you if this were true or whether you could verify the information.

Now I give you all that as background for the statement that you're alleged to have made, which was that it was heard confidentially but "you weren't supposed to talk about it." Thereupon, Mr. Jaffe stated that Gauss had told this fact to an OSS man and that the OSS man had told it to Gayn. Whereupon it is alleged that you told Mr. Jaffe that, so far as you knew, the whereabouts of General Stilwell was very confidential. Mr. Jaffe is alleged then to have stated that whether or not General Stilwell was in the Pacific would be known shortly, would be known on Saturday night, because he was due to speak at some gathering and later to have a meeting with General MacArthur. It is then alleged that you said, "That is how top secrets get out."

Now will you explain what you said on that occasion? Can you recollect any such discussion and can you state what you said?

To review the several statements in the course of this conversation you are supposed to have made, they are in substance: (1) that the fact that Stilwell was down in the Pacific was heard confidentially but you weren't supposed to talk about it; (2) that the whereabouts of General Stilwell was very confidential; and (3) that if it got out, as Jaffe had stated, "that is how top secrets get out." Those are the statements you are alleged to have made. Perhaps you might explain what information, if any, you had about the whereabouts of Stilwell and what you may have said or can recollect having said on the subject.

A. Well, I don't recall this conversation. I think I have already testified that, since it is all a mystery to me, perhaps if we had the complete text—but it seems to me that, if this is a correct and complete text, I was being very discreet. I don't have any recollection of hearing of this alleged conversation or conversations between Gauss, Gould as relayed to Gayn and as repeated to

Jaffe. Nor do I remember anything about this conversation, or hearing anything about this conversation of the OSS men and Gayn. It seems to me I avoided saying anything definitely about the whereabouts of General Stilwell except that people were saying he is in the Pacific. But the whereabouts of high officers during wartime is a secret.

Q. Did you, as a matter of fact, know where he was, Mr. Service?—A. I knew that he was going out to the Pacific. I don't know when or where. I knew it first from General Stilwell himself. I think that he was planning to go. I was seeing his associates all the time. Now, this business of Saturday night confuses me except that he was expected to speak to a meeting in New York and the reference to that may simply have been that if he is unable to appear on Saturday night why it would be obvious that he is away some place.

Q. That was, of course, the remark that Jaffe was supposed to have said.—A. But my statement of this, "that is how top secrets get out," I suppose was referring to all the various rumors and statements by OSS people and Randall Gould and so on and so on.

Q. Who was Randall Gould?—A. Randall Gould had been for many years the editor of the Shanghai Evening Post and Mercury, a newspaper published in Shanghai by C. V. Starr. During the war he was in the United States. He wrote a book on China. And then later he went to Chungking and set up the Chungking edition of the Shanghai Evening Post and Mercury which came out weekly for a while in Chungking. After the war he returned to Shanghai and was finally, I think, forced to close down publication after the Communists occupied Shanghai and imprisoned him in his offices and that caused a great deal of trouble for him.

Mr. ACHILLES. Do you recall whether on that same occasion you again discussed the possibility of American landings in China and the location of those landings?

A. I have no recollection, sir, but it's quite possible that in a speculative way there might have been some such discussion. I think by this time we were finding probably in the middle of the Okinawa campaign that there was general speculation that any landing, if we made one, would be further north in China than it might have been at an earlier stage of the war. If we held Okinawa it might seem more logical to any armchair strategist to hit straight across in North China.

Mr. STEVENS. Do you recall any?

A. No sir, I have no such recollection.

Q. I should complete my statement of this alleged conversation you are supposed to have had with Jaffe by saying it is stated that Mr. Jaffe asked you whether you thought that the United States would land on the shores of China, and that you told him, "I don't believe it has been decided. I can tell you in a couple of weeks when Stilwell gets back. I rather think we will." It is then stated that Mr. Jaffe remarked that, if we did land in China, it would probably be in Shanghai and that then we would accept aid from anybody, Communist or non-Communist.—A. This is Mr. Jaffe?

Q. Yes; and you agreed with Mr. Jaffe that that was correct.—A. I don't remember making any such statement and I don't see how I could have made a statement like that, that "I can tell you in a few weeks when General Stilwell gets back," because that assumes in the first place that General Stilwell was going to tell me what his plans were and General Stilwell never confided in me. He confided in very few people.

Mr. STEVENS. Do you know whether General Stilwell was going to get back in 2 or 3 weeks?

A. No, sir; I don't recall that I did know it. As a matter of fact, he didn't come back. He stayed out there. That statement is rather incomprehensible.

Mr. ACHILLES. That statement carries the implication that you were offering voluntary information as to the whereabouts of General Stilwell, which is obviously a serious implication.

A. It's just incomprehensible to me. I don't have any such recollection of such statements and I don't see how I could be in any position to promise, since I never received any information on high military plans from General Stilwell ever.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you said a minute ago that General Stilwell had told you something; what was it?

A. Well, I saw General Stilwell some time in that spring after I came back. And he said that he wanted to go out in the Pacific and get himself a job.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, that is what you referred to.

A. He wanted to get a fighting job. He didn't want to be sitting in a desk here in Washington. But that is the sum total of what I remember that General Stilwell told me.

Questions by Mr. ACHILLES:

Q. Had you discussed any military plans, anything of that nature, with General Stilwell?—A. No, sir.

Q. At that time did you not know where General Stilwell was?—A. My recollection is that all I knew was that he was going out in the Pacific. Of course he was going to see General MacArthur, wherever General MacArthur was. That could be assumed. I don't know that I had any specific knowledge as to where he was at any particular time.

Q. So far as you know, all that General Stilwell was doing was looking for a fighting job?—A. That is correct, sir.

Mr. RHETTS. I wonder if the Board can tell me what this purports to be. Does this purport to be an account given by Mr. Jaffe? Does this purport to be a recording of a conversation made by some mechanical device? Does it purport to be the notes made by some person listening to the conversation? Is there any way that the Board can enlighten us at all on that? My reason for asking the Board this question is this: Of course Mr. Service was questioned earlier in these proceedings on this same general subject matter. He has been questioned again in these vague terms within the past 2 days before the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and it is obviously of the greatest importance to ascertain precisely what source, what reportorial source, the Board has available to it. Because it seems to me I think anyone who has any dealings with these matters will recognize that an actual recording of a conversation is one thing. Notes taken by a person listening with earphones and a person who may or may not be familiar with the subject matter of the discussion is another thing. And a summary prepared by another person, someone who had no knowledge of the matter is still a third and different thing.

The material which General Snow has been referring to here so obviously suggests condensations, epitomizations, and the like, which makes it, it seems to me, extremely important that we try to ascertain the exact source of the material which the Board is using.

The CHAIRMAN. I'll say for the record that the Board has only the reports of the FBI on which to rely. We do not have the exact texts of these supposed statements. The source, as far as the Board is free to reveal, is a confidential source from the FBI. We have nothing further. It is a source which is unavailable for appearance before the Board. According to the public press in yesterday's hearing the actual source of these statements is a recording. As to the facts, the Board is unable to make a statement.

Mr. RHETTS. In that connection, if I might comment, I too am aware of the report in the public press. On the other hand, I'm still not enlightened as to whether it is an actual recording or whether it is notes purported to have been made by someone who was listening or whether they are stenographic transcripts or what.

The CHAIRMAN. The reports of the FBI do not advise the Board on that subject.

Mr. SERVICE. It seems to me that even if there is a recording we still have the question of the completeness and clarity and the perfection of those recordings because in a conversation which I'm alleged to have had on May 19—

The CHAIRMAN. May 29.

Mr. SERVICE. May 29; yes, sir. It would appear that they have exactly reversed the intent of what I seem to recall saying possibly by the omission of a few words or failing to catch a few words.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the Board is unable to give you any further enlightenment on the subject.

Mr. ACHILLES. To return to the specific statements that you are supposed to have made to Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Service, that you did not believe it is decided whether we would land on the shores of China but that you would be able to tell him in a couple of weeks when General Stilwell got back, would you have told Mr. Jaffe such information had you known it, as to whether or not the United States would in fact in future land on the shores of China?

A. It all depends. I mean—I'm trying to just speculate as to what was in my own mind if I made such a statement, which I don't recall making.

Mr. ACHILLES. Would you please read the question again.

(Whereupon the reporter reread the previous question.)

A. No; I would not have told him if they were secret plans. I would not have told him any secret war plans. The reason I was trying to speculate what was in the back of my mind was that I understood that the whole subject was under discussion and that if there had been a large open build-up for a landing such as, shall we say, on the Normandy coast—and that was no secret about the fact that we were going to land in Europe—I believe that what I was thinking was that after General Stilwell came back that it would probably become obvious, because presumably he wanted to be in command of a preparation for a large-scale operation, whether or not we were preparing to build up for an operation on the mainland. That is the only basis I can think of that I would have been able to tell anyone whether or not—

Questions by Mr. STEVENS:

Q. This is pure speculation?—A. This is pure speculation. I certainly would not have told him any secret plan. I probably wouldn't have known any secret plan. If I had known any I never would have told him.

Q. If you had known that we were going to land in China would you have told him?—A. It all depends on the circumstances. That is, what I'm trying to say, I would not have told him anything which was not well known. But there was no secret that we were going to land on Sicily long before we did. There was no secret that we were going to land in Italy. There was no secret that we were going to land somewhere on the coast of France. That is the only basis on which I can think that I would have any way of knowing or telling anyone.

Questions by Mr. ACHILLES:

Q. As I recall, those cases of where we were going to land was a matter of vital secrecy.—A. Where, yes, but am I not purported to have said that I simply would not be able to tell him whether we were going to land in China?

Q. That is correct.—A. And Jaffe goes on to speculate that it would be in the vicinity of Shanghai, I don't know where.

Q. Mr. Jaffe is purported to have said if we did land in China it would probably be in Shanghai and that then we would accept aid from anybody, Communist or non-Communist. And you are said to have agreed that that was correct. It does not indicate which of Mr. Jaffe's statements you agreed was correct. It could be either the landing in Shanghai or if we did land in Shanghai we would accept aid from anybody there.—A. If I remember, I mentioned earlier it was General Stilwell's hope—I think I used the word "dream" before—that he would have the chance to be in command of a landing operation in China. It was his private hope that he would be able to march back to Peiping, and so on. And I may have assumed that after his return there would be public indication of, as I say, a build-up for a large-scale landing. But that is just pure speculation. I think that I ought to make that clear.

I think I ought to make it clear to the Board that I would never have known any of the secret plans, never did know them, and never would have revealed them to Mr. Jaffe or anyone else, that the only conceivable basis for this statement was that possibly within a few weeks—since the progress of the war was rapid at that time—that it would become obvious whether or not we were preparing to mount a large-scale-offensive landing in China.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Service, in your experience out there or anywhere with respect to the war, was it ever common knowledge as to whether a build-up was for one area in the Pacific or another? If I recall correctly, the assembly lines were sending things out. We knew that material was going out to the west coast, as far as the United States was concerned, but I don't think it was common knowledge in the United States as to where any material was going which left the west coast. And that was something that was considered rather secret here, as to whether we were going into any particular section of the Pacific. I doubt very much, if my memory serves me correctly, that that was ever common knowledge here, whether there was a build-up in China or for some other place. In your experience was it otherwise?

A. I have only been speculating here, sir, because I have no positive recollection.

Questions by the CHAIRMAN:

Q. As a matter of fact, you were also speculating, weren't you, when you referred to the common knowledge of the landing in Sicily? As a matter of fact, that never was common knowledge. Sicily is a small place. If it had been



common knowledge that we were going to land in Sicily the landing place would have been pretty well known.—A. Well, I was speculating.

Q. You weren't here and didn't know whether it was or was not common knowledge, did you?

A. My recollection of the chain of events at that time was that we knocked out Pantelleris and did other actions, bombing preparations, and so on, which pointed toward the occupation of Sicily before we went on to attempt an occupation in Italy. It was generally assumed, I imagine, that it would be dangerous for us to attack Italy directly without first taking Sicily.

Questions by Mr. STEVENS:

Q. I think if you look back, Mr. Service, none of this, as far as the United States was concerned, was common knowledge at any time until after the matter was an accomplished fact. I think that is true with regard to the build-up that took effect in the United Kingdom with regard to North Africa, if I'm right. All of it, there was a speculation in the United States, but there was never any common knowledge as to whether it was likely to be in a theater of war. I'd just like for you to search back and see if in any of your visits to the United States, of which there were not many, you could get anything which you would have considered common knowledge of an act before that act occurred. Certainly in my memory, being in Washington all during the war, I cannot recall any such thing.

A. I'm not sure that I understand your question, Mr. Stevens.

Q. I'm not just sure that in your speculation you used the word "common knowledge" advisedly, Mr. Service.—A. Common knowledge?

Q. Yes.—A. Common assumption, perhaps.

Q. It is necessary for the Board to get that clarified a bit. If you speculated about Sicily and Normandy and others—A. I should have limited it to Normandy, I suppose. I should have included the whole coast of France.

Q. Was there any common knowledge as to what the plans of General MacArthur and the people—Admiral Nimitz and others—where we were going to strike next?—A. Well, we get into a problem of what point. Certainly I would say that our maneuvers toward the Philippines indicated at a very early point our intention to recapture the Philippines.

Mr. ACHILLES. On the occasion of one of your conversations with Jaffe, I believe you discussed with him a report which you and a Mr. Adler worked on jointly. Who was Mr. Adler?

A. Mr. Adler was the United States Treasury attaché in Chungking from about 1942 through to the end of the war. I believe he remained Treasury attaché until 1946 or '47. I'm not sure just when he came back to the United States. He was also the American member of the Chinese Stabilization Board.

Q. I believe you testified you lived with him.—A. I lived with him for a period in Chungking, I believe for about a year. That was chiefly because living in Army officer's quarters had been very hampering to my work which involved a great deal of contact with the Chinese. I could not entertain Chinese in the Army mess. There was no sitting room or other place available where I could meet people and talk with them. Mr. Adler had an apartment, had an extra room, which he offered to me, so I shared his apartment with him.

Q. Do you have any particular impression as to his political views at that time?—A. Well, it's very hard to describe the word "Liberal." I would say he is a liberal. I had no indication or ever any reason to believe he was a Communist or even close to a Communist.

Q. That follows now as well as then?—A. Yes, sir.

Questions by Mr. ACHILLES.

Q. You did know him, I assume, quite well, having lived with him for a year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the nature of your duties and his duties, did you and he have occasion to collaborate in preparing reports on more than this one particular occasion?

Mr. RHEETS. On what particular occasion are we referring to now, sir?

Q. This was a report prepared in connection with Mr. Wallace's visit to China, which I believe Mr. Service stated he and Mr. Adler worked on together.—A. Mr. Adler was a very active person and lived in the city away from the Embassy. He spent a great deal of his time with the Chinese and particularly with Chinese people in financial and economic fields, bankers, government officials, in those fields. And he developed an unusually broad circle of Chinese contacts along those lines.

I also developed an unusually broad circle of contacts, an entirely different one, among entirely different ones, among entirely different groups, so that we had very little overlapping. But between the two of us—how shall I say—we covered a good deal of ground. So that we, living together, seeing each other usually in the latter part of every evening, talked to each other, exchanged views, news, and we did, I think you might say, work together continually. Certainly the news which he obtained from me entered in a way into his reports and the information which I got from him was at times invaluable to me in broadening my own knowledge and perspective of what was going on.

Mr. Adler was, as I say, in an independent position. He had weekly or monthly reports for the Treasury and occasionally if negotiations were going on he had more frequent reporting in connection with those negotiations. Similarly I had only a limited number of required duties. Both of us spent a good deal of time picking up information, doing some voluntary reporting. A great deal of his information went through conversations, and so on, to the Embassy. Mine also, of course, went to the Embassy eventually.

But on our own initiative we did undertake what you might call several projects. One of them was this memorandum, which is our Document 157, which as I have said was written shortly before Mr. Wallace's visit—Vice President Wallace's visit. I did most of the initial drafting and then I would go over it with him and he would suggest some changes. Perhaps he would work over a draft and then I would rework it, and so on, so that both of us made some contributions.

Now, another independent voluntary enterprise that we undertook was the translation and summarization and comment on the Generalissimo's book of the Chinese economic theory. We introduced that into the proceedings here a few days ago. I have forgotten the B number.

Q. Adler was at that time recognized, was he not, as probably the best informed person on the Chinese economic situation?—A. I believe he certainly was, sir. He was extremely well informed. And he was the only man we had in Chungking who was well informed on Chinese finance and economics. He was invaluable to the Embassy and he assisted the Embassy a great deal. He was in the closest, most intimate contact with the Chinese economic figures from H. H. Kung on down.

Q. Turning to a different matter, some days ago I remember questioning you concerning your discussion with Jaffe of April 20, 1945; as I recall you stated that you had arrived at Mr. Jaffe's room in the Statler Hotel only shortly before luncheon and that I advised you according to the FBI you were reported to have gone to Mr. Jaffe's room at the Statler Hotel at about 9:30 o'clock that morning, that you were unable to recollect having done so or having gone there earlier than shortly before lunch. I wonder in the meantime if you had a chance to recollect anything further about that morning? Where you might have spent the morning?—A. I'm still unable to recollect, sir, having spent any long time in conversation with Mr. Jaffe on that morning. And, therefore, I'm still of the belief that my hypothesis was correct that I may have taken these memoranda to his hotel in the early forenoon, perhaps at the time 9:30, which has been mentioned, and that I left them with him. I left the hotel and returned there shortly before lunch, expecting to have them returned to me. There is one recollection—it's a vague recollection—which may relate to that day.

Q. What is that recollection?—A. That is that I believe at some time in my early association with Mr. Jaffe this book of the generalissimo's on the Chinese economic theory was mentioned and that he said that he had not seen it and that I took to him, among the papers, memoranda and so on, a translation of the book and this summary and comment and that Jaffe was interested and asked me if he could make some use of the material. I told him that he could not, meaning he could not use the summary and analysis which had been prepared in the major part by Mr. Adler, which I had no authority to allow him to use.

Q. The point is of some interest because it is the only point, as I recall, at which the statements you have made—both to the FBI in 1945 and to the board—differ from information furnished by the FBI. But I take it that your best recollection is still that you did not spend that morning in Mr. Jaffe's room at the Statler Hotel?—A. That is correct. Might I suggest, sir, if in fact I did remain the whole morning in conversation with Mr. Jaffe, which I have no recollection of doing, there should be substantial evidence of the fact since Mr. Jaffe was under such close surveillance. And if there is such evidence I would appreciate having it made known to me.

Q. We have no such evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. I'd like to ask you, Mr. Service, if you care to give us a comprehensive statement of your attitude with reference to communism as a dogma with application to the United States. Are you a Communist or do you believe in the Communist theory of government and social and economic order or not? Or do you believe in what we call the capitalist system? I don't know that you have given us anywhere in your statement a comprehensive statement of your personal beliefs on that.

The board would like a short recess.

(Whereupon the board recessed at 12 noon and reconvened at 12:05 p. m.)

Mr. RHETT. I'd like to make a preliminary statement. When Mr. Kennan testified here on May 29, 1950, in the afternoon session, the board may recall that at the conclusion of his testimony he submitted to the board the notes he had made on the various reports. The board will also recall that while most of these papers consisted of actual reports written by Mr. Service there were a few memoranda included in this group which constituted memoranda made by other agencies concerning interviews with Mr. Service.

One of these reports, which is our Document No. 200, is a memorandum dated November 8, 1944, and entitled "Interview with John Service" and under that "Japanese Communists." This memorandum is a memorandum of notes of an interview held with Mr. Service evidently at the offices of the Research and Analysis Branch of OSS. In the course of this memorandum or notes is stated at the top of page 2 in connection with the discussion of the extent of contact with the Japanese Communists have with the outside world—this is the Japanese Communists who were then in Yenan—"Material cannot be sent through Russia, although they undoubtedly have contact with a Russian station. Actually, they can get no information out except by radio, although Service mentioned that he himself had helped in carrying information. Material going out of Yenan is heavily censored by the Chinese."

Now, amongst the notes which Mr. Kennan prepared on these documents we have noted two references to this particular statement which I have just read from Document 200. Mr. Kennan's notes on this appear on page 15 of his notes which are attached to the transcript for the afternoon session, May 29, 1950. In view of the implications of that statement, it seemed desirable for us to attempt to clarify it.

The CHAIRMAN. What did Mr. Kennan say about it?

Mr. RHETTS. Mr. Kennan merely noted with respect to this Document No. 200. His notes are as follows:

"Interrogation of Service while on consultation in Washington. Views on Japanese Communists. Appears to be purely factual information. Service states that he himself helped carry information for Japanese Communists, apparently out of Yenan to Chungking for relay elsewhere. No elaboration."

Now, it is in connection with this matter that I would like to interrogate Mr. Fisher briefly and then Mr. Service again.

The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead.

Thereupon Mr. Francis McCracken Fisher, being produced, sworn and examined as a witness for and in behalf of Mr. John Stewart Service, testified as follows:

Questions by Mr. RHETTS:

Q. Will you please state your full name for the record?—A. Francis McCracken Fisher.

Q. And your address?—A. 2313 South June Street, Arlington.

Q. What is your present position, sir?—A. A student at the National War College, detailed from the State Department.

Q. Were you in China during the period approximately of July to October 1944, Mr. Fisher?—A. Continuously.

Q. What was your position there at that time?—A. The head of the Office of War Information activities throughout China. Might I add to that, I had been told unofficially by General Stilwell soon after he arrived there that he wanted me to be in charge or at least pass on all matters of psychological warfare against the Japanese.

Q. So that you were particularly concerned with that range of matters in relation to the Japs?—A. Certainly.

Q. During that period did you have occasion to visit Yenan?—A. I was asked to do so by the commanding general. Might I add to that?

Q. Yes.—A. We had heard rumors that the Japanese and the Communists themselves were having some considerable effect in securing the surrender of

Japanese prisoners. This was rather unique in 1944 and it was felt apparently worth while exploring the methods and means and so forth that they were using in their psychological approach to the Japanese. Therefore, I was instructed in my capacity that I just mentioned to go to Yen-an and contact those people I could find who were engaged in the psychological warfare against the Japanese, to study their methods as fully as possible and report thereon.

Q. During what period were you in Yen-an, sir?—A. Approximately 2 weeks, from the latter part of August to early September. I can't give you the exact dates.

Q. In 1944?—A. Yes, 1944.

Q. And did you know Mr. Service there, at that time?—A. I did.

Q. Did you have occasion to work with him in Yen-an?—A. I took occasion to, sir. May I explain that?

Q. Yes.—A. Very soon after I had talked to the various Chinese Communists, the Army people in charge of psychological warfare, they put me on to Okano, who was the head of the Japanese People's Emancipation League and was mainly the main spring or brain of the psychological-warfare effort. I had long interviews with him. On numerous occasions I had long talks with him. At one point he said that tomorrow he would be glad to tell me what the postwar Japanese Communist program was. I felt that this was something outside my particular range and should be of interest politically to the Government as a whole and suggested to Mr. Service that he sit in on that interview. That is why, on the occasion, I sought his help on a matter outside my range. But I thought it would be of importance to the United States Government.

Q. Were there also Japanese located in Chungking who were also working in the general area of attempting to convert the Japanese away from support of the Japanese war efforts?—A. There were two groups in general. They were under two Japanese. One was named Kaji Wataru and his wife. There was another group working under a man named Ao Yama. I don't recall the rest of his name. These two groups or cliques or factions had been in China for a considerable period of time. They had been working, some of them, with the Chinese Government and the Kuomintang even before the war. And they were in touch with or had been contacted, had been sought by the OSS in particular during the preceding months there in Chungking.

These two groups appeared to be somewhat ineffectual. Their activities seemed to be mostly directed toward news sheets and pamphlets. I never knew just what the circulation of them was. But some of them were in contact with the very small number of Japanese prisoners captured by the Chinese and were attempting to, under the direction of the Chinese Government, utilize these prisoners in psychological warfare in that realm.

Q. That was also one of the activities in which Mr. Okano was engaged in and around Yen-an?—A. As far as I know, principally he was engaged in that, yes.

Q. Now, do you have any knowledge whether there was any communication between Mr. Okano and his group in Yen-an and the groups in Chungking, of which you just spoke?—A. I noticed that the transcript stated that the Chinese severely censored all material going out of Yen-an—that is of course, as you know, the Chinese Government, the Kuomintang secret police, and so forth established more or less a blockade there and as a result of that there was very little communication as far as I knew between them. Occasionally some publication or some leaflet would get across and there was vague knowledge on both sides, if you want to call them sides, between the Japanese group in Chungking and the Japanese group in Yen-an. There was vague knowledge about what the other group was doing and what it was interested in.

Q. Do you know whether you or the American Government officials had any occasion or interest in attempting to permit some communication between Okano and his group from Yen-an with the other groups in Chungking?—A. I can't testify as to a specific instance but I can testify as to background. The answer in general is "yes," that would be parallel to the general theory at that time, and I want you to mark that time, early September 1944, in uniting all elements available in fighting effectively against the Japanese. I think shortly after I came back from Yen-an General Hurley went to Yen-an with exactly, precisely the same mission.

There was interest in seeing whether increased effectiveness could be obtained in psychological warfare effort by an increase in communication between these two groups. I know that on one occasion at least—I can't testify as to the exact time, but my impression is that it was October or November of 1944—there came through the regular communications channels some sort of communication, either

a statement or a letter or something, from Okano which was made available to Kaji and Aoyama in Chungking in the hopes there would be coalescence—not coalescence but it would be increased effectiveness through cooperation.

Q. Now, as I understand it, Kaji and Aoyama were working for the American forces? Or was it for the Chinese?—A. Cooperating. It's a little hard to describe the exact part—

Q. Perhaps I may make my question a little clearer. They were working in cooperation with your group which was interested in promoting the psychological warfare?—A. They were. When we would evolve a leaflet in Japanese to be dropped we would naturally seek to get the best critique from the Japanese viewpoint as was possible and we would ask them to criticize it, as we would the group in Yen-an.

And, may I add one more thing. I gathered there was perhaps a closer relationship on the part of the morale operations branch of the Office of Strategic Services in Chungking with these two groups. I don't know how effective or useful it was, but I know they sought to maintain contact with these two groups.

Q. When you referred a moment ago to your general recollection of some communication coming through the regular official channels from Okano in Yen-an to the group in Chungking, would that have been through Army channels?—A. All channels. I should describe the set-up as far as I know it, and that is that the observer mission in Yen-an transmitted documents and so forth, reports, to headquarters, to Army headquarters in Chungking. It was an Army mission there. We maintained an observer with it from time to time. But, as far as I know, all communications coming from Yen-an were screened at the input end. The chief or his designated authority in Yen-an would receive them at headquarters in Chungking—whether they were checked or not I don't know, I assume they were all checked. We got them I believe, as I recall, from the G-2 office. When some things were addressed to us they came through that channel and we picked them up through G-2. The regular practice was that everything was checked at both ends.

Q. During the period that you were either in Chungking or Yen-an, did you ever have any knowledge that any communications were being sent out by Okano other than this limited communication with the Kaji group in Chungking that you referred to?—A. Well, I should refer here to one general means of communication they had in a sense, and that was the Japanese People's Emancipation League and Okano frequently published articles and reviews and things in the Chieh Fang Jih Pao.

Mr. SERVICE. It means the Liberation Daily.

A. That was the official Communist newspaper.

Q. Where?—A. In Yen-an. And, as I recall, from time to time some of these articles were broadcast. I would have assumed that some of them would have been broadcast by the Eighth Route Army radio in their daily news through the Communist newspapers through all the liberated areas. So I assume in addition to this limited communication that we just referred to that there was a certain amount of sort of semipublic broadcast of articles and information and things from that source. I don't know if that adds anything. I don't know of any other specific direct communication, nor do I have any knowledge or suspicion that there was any, what you might term, irregular communication.

The CHAIRMAN. Surreptitious communication?

A. Surreptitious. It was not subject to the complete approval or screening of headquarters.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Fisher.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. RHETTS. Will you take the stand, Mr. Service.

Thereupon Mr. John Stewart Service, a witness previously produced and sworn in his own behalf, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

Question by Mr. RHETTS:

Q. Can you shed any further light on this quotation from Document 200 which I have read into the record?—A. Well, I think that I'm perhaps a victim in a way of extreme condensation. This was an interview which undoubtedly lasted for 2 or 3 hours, which has been condensed into 3 pages. And I believe that what I said was something that we or the observer mission had allowed some communication with these other Japanese groups. I'm sure that there was some explanation and further on in the paper I mention Ao Yama and the other Japanese who were cooperating with us on psychological warfare work in Chungking. My recollection is that fairly soon after the arrival of the observer mission in Yen-an—that would be in July.

The CHAIRMAN. 1944?

A. Yes, 1944. There were a number of people in the group who were Japanese specialists who came in contact with Okano and had to find out as part of their work what the Japanese were doing with the prisoners and Okano asked whether or not it would be possible for him to send a letter to these other free Japanese groups in Chungking. I remember his intent was to establish some sort of consultation on the work they were doing, their objectives; I think perhaps to explore the possibility of whether or not they could more or less agree on their objectives.

We agreed—I say “we,” I mean the observer group—to allow such a letter to be sent. I remember the group I was living with—Colonel Barrett, the Commander, I remember having a translation made and carefully studied by some of our Japanese experts and we agreed to forward it through official channels over the G-2 in Chungking for transmission, if G-2 thought wise, to the Japanese groups. That is the only occasion that I can remember of having any knowledge or where I was in any way connected with the transmitting of messages for these Japanese Communist leaders to anyone outside.

Q. As far as you recall, did you ever personally carry any communication of any kind from Okano or any of the Japanese Communists out of Yensen?—A. No, sir, I have no recollection of every carrying any messages.

Q. So far as you know?—A. I was concerned only in consultation as to whether or not the group would transmit, by official channels through G-2, this letter.

Q. So it is your belief that this reference in the memo, this assertion that you mentioned that you yourself had helped carry information merely refers to the fact that the observer mission officially permitted Okano to transmit written communication through official channels to Chungking for delivery to the other Japanese groups there?—A. That is correct.

Q. And the inferences which Mr. Kenman may have drawn in his notes on the document are not proper inferences?—A. Let's say they go even beyond this. They are not proper inferences. Even this [indicating] I think is incorrect.

Q. By “this” you mean the document, Document 200?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now could you answer the question asked before the recess, the general question as to your respect for communism, as to theory?—A. It's difficult to talk about a man's philosophy. That is something I'm not used to doing. I'm not a deeply religious man in a conventional sense of the word. But I think that I could sum it up by saying that it is my belief that life was not created accidentally, that there is a divine cause, and that man was not created accidentally but created as the ultimate and highest form of life.

I think that man's responsibility, or his destiny if you wish, is to seek to achieve or live up to his highest potentialities, not only as individuals but as a race. We have not succeeded in doing that. We are very far from doing it. There have been certain individuals in history—Jesus Christ was one—who have given us an insight into the qualities of mind and spirit for which man is unique and which makes him the highest product of creation, which serve as examples of what we should seek to achieve.

Now, this whole basic philosophy is built on the idea of, shall we say, the dignity of man. Man cannot advance toward this goal of perfection without the greatest freedom of expression, greatest freedom of experiment, greatest freedom to improve and develop himself. That whole idea is absolutely contrary to a fixed and rigid dogma.

I don't believe that there is any fixed dogma which is the ultimate truth. I'm sure that communism is not because it is completely contrary to human nature and would put us in a strait-jacket and instead of giving the fullest scope for individual development it puts man in a strait-jacket and subordinates him to a monolithic state or a completely monolithic totalitarian party.

The political expression, of course, of this kind of philosophy is democracy, democracy of a very complete developed sort which must be centered about the recognition of the dignity and rights of the individual.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean the basis of the philosophy which you are expounding?

A. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Not the basis of communism?

A. No, the philosophy which I'm expounding, which is the antithesis of my view of communism. Related to my own view of the rights and dignity of men and the political expression which I think is democracy, is my idea on economics, because the kind of democracy which I believe in must be based on free enterprise. It must be based on the opportunity of the individual. I think that com-

petition is necessary and is basic for this whole process of self improvement, of trying to develop ourselves, that complete controls stifle, restrain our own efforts at progress.

I think that one of the strengths of the American system is that we ourselves are not tied to any rigid plan, or dogma—I use this word "dogma" over much perhaps. What I'm saying is that I'm not a complete believer in unrestricted capitalism, that my deep feeling about protection of the rights of the individual necessitates some restrictions and control on capitalism. But we in the United States have been able to achieve a balance between the protection of the rights of the individual and the affording of the fullest opportunity for improvement and advancement with competition and encouragement and free enterprise, all of which I think are important.

I think it's obvious, from this clumsy effort to state what I believe, that I am not a Communist, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. ACHILLES. In my opinion, that is a very fine statement.

Mr. SERVICE. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Board is adjourned.

The Board adjourned at 12:50 p. m.

EXHIBITS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE LOYALTY SECURITY BOARD—  
PROCEEDINGS IN THE CASE OF JOHN STEWART SERVICE

EXHIBIT No. 1

This exhibit not available.

This was a compilation of material collected for reference use of members of the Loyalty Security Board which retained all copies. All important material has been incorporated in the transcript.

Contents were:

Chronology of movements and events relating to John S. Service, 1941-49.

Quotations from material containing charges against Mr. Service.

The texts of a number of significant reports drafted by Mr. Service.

The transcript of testimony before the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee (Hobbs committee) during its investigation of the Amerasia case (from Congressional Record, May 22, 1950).

Excerpts from the China white paper including annex 47 which was largely made up of quotations from Mr. Service's reports.

EXHIBIT No. 2

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

[NEW YORK 27, N. Y.]

EAST ASIAN INSTITUTE

433 West One Hundred and Seventieth Street.

MARCH 28, 1950.

Mr. JOHN B. PEURIFOY,

*Assistant Secretary of State, United States Department of State,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR Mr. PEURIFOY: Allow me to offer myself as a character witness for Mr. John S. Service in the event this is necessary in the forthcoming investigation. Mr. Service and I have been closest friends since boyhood days in Shanghai, we roomed together in college, and have kept in close touch with one another ever since. I should count it an honor to testify as to his absolute integrity and loyalty to the United States, as well as pay tribute to his intellectual honesty and idealism.

If there is any way in which I can assist in this matter of clearing up his record in the public mind please call upon me. No such clearance is necessary so far as the Department is concerned, I am sure.

Very truly yours,

C. MARTIN WILBUR,

*Associate Professor of Chinese History, Columbia University.*

## EXHIBIT No. 3

BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE,  
Washington, D. C., January 2, 1943.

Mr. MAX THORNBERG,  
Petroleum Adviser, Department of State,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THORNBERG: This is in reference to a report from Third Secretary John S. Service, at Chungking, dated November 11, 1942, and entitled "The Kansu Oil Wells." This report comprised several enclosures to Report No. 755 from Chungking, which bears the date November 24.

The Petroleum Division of this Branch has asked that I request you to transmit our particular thanks and appreciation to Mr. Service. His despatch is exceedingly thorough and comprehensive, and is all the more commendable since it was not written by an oil technician.

All phases of the subject covered by Mr. Service have been of marked interest to us. We will be grateful if we are given any further information on this subject which may become available from time to time.

With my very best regards, I remain  
Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. RAYNOR,  
Chief, Technical Branch.

## EXHIBIT No. 4

CHUNGKING, August 16, 1943.

JOHN S. SERVICE, Esquire,  
Second Secretary of Embassy,  
Care of General Stilwell's Headquarters, Chungking.

SIR: Upon the termination of your detail to Lanchow and your detachment from the Embassy to service on the staff of General Stilwell, the Embassy wishes to express to you its appreciation of the political and other reports it has received from you during your tour of duty at Lanchow.

Your reports were clearly and concisely written, they reflected ingenuity in observation and in the gathering of information under difficult circumstances, and industry and awareness of developments and trends of interest and of the importance thereof. Your reports contained information of much interest and value to the Embassy and the Embassy considers that your reports, and your activities in connection with reporting, were of high quality and may in general be characterized as excellent.

A copy of this letter is being forwarded to the Department of State.  
Very truly yours,

GEORGE ATCHESON, Jr.  
American Chargé d'Affaires a. i.

A true copy of the signed original.

## EXHIBIT No. 5

OCTOBER 1, 1943.

Copy: ap.  
No. 411.

The Honorable CLARENCE E. GAUSS,  
American Ambassador, Chungking.

SIR: The Department has noted with gratification the quality of the reporting from Second Secretary Service while he was on detail at Lanchow. In particular, the reports submitted under cover of the Embassy's despatches no. 1485 of August 18 and no. 1493 of August 20 have impressed officers of the Department with their value and timeliness, as has also the report which formed the subject of the Embassy's commendatory despatch no. 1411 of July 31, 1943. The thorough and objective manner in which Mr. Service covered "The Political Situation in Kansu" in his despatch no. 9 (Embassy's no. 1485) has afforded officers of the Department a very useful guide to an understanding of conditions in Kansu, and his report on "Treatment of Foreigners in the Northwest," no. 21 (Embassy's no. 1493), contains evidence not only of careful study of the subject but also



2476 STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

of successful activity on the part of Mr. Service in ameliorating difficulties encountered by American citizens.

The Department requests that the Embassy bring this expression of appreciation of his work to the attention of Mr. Service.

Very truly yours,

G. HOWLAND SHAW  
(For the Secretary of State).

FE:JCV:ALM/MS. FE.  
9-28-43.

EXHIBIT No. 6

Copy for FP.  
No. 431.

The Honorable CLARENCE E. GAUSS,  
*American Ambassador, Chungking.*

SIR: In acknowledging the receipt of the Embassy's despatch no. 1410, dated July 31, 1943, enclosing despatch no. 6, dated July 5, 1943, entitled: "Chinese Propaganda as Shown by Wall Slogans in the Northwest" prepared by Mr. John S. Service, American Foreign Service Officer on detail at Lanchow, it is a pleasure to inform you that the Department has accorded to the latter despatch a rating of EXCELLENT, in view of the timeliness and value of the information contained therein and the careful analysis it presents of the subject matter.

The contents of this instruction should be brought to the notice of Mr. Service who should be commended for his initiative in preparing a report on this subject.

Very truly yours,

(For the Secretary of State).

DCR:GHK:AGH. FE. FP. 10/14/43.

EXHIBIT No. 7

Copy: ap.

JUNE 21, 1944.

Unrestricted.  
No. 698.

The Honorable CLARENCE E. GAUSS,  
*American Ambassador, Chungking.*

SIR: In connection with current developments in Sinkiang having an important bearing on Sino-Soviet relations, the Department has found of much interest and value the report on the situation in Sinkiang submitted under cover of the Embassy's despatch no. 2461 of April 21, 1944, by Second Secretary John S. Service, on detail to General Stilwell's staff. This report has been given the grade of "Excellent."

The timeliness and high standard of Mr. Service's reporting continues to be a cause of satisfaction to the Department.

It is requested that you inform Mr. Service of this further commendation of his work.

Very truly yours,

G. HOWLAND SHAW  
(For the Secretary of State).

761.93/171.  
CA:ASC:MHP.  
6/13/44. FE.

EXHIBIT No. 8

Copy: ap.

JANUARY 13, 1945.

No. 5.

The Honorable PATRICK J. HURLEY,  
*American Ambassador, Chungking.*

SIR: Officers in the Department have read with interest and appreciation the report entitled "The Development of Communist Political Control in the Guerilla Bases," which was prepared by Second Secretary of Embassy John S. Service

and transmitted under cover of the Embassy's despatch no. 3022 of September 29, 1944.

In view of the importance of the subject matter of this report, of the thoughtful and comprehensive character of the study, and of the clear and logical manner in which the information and views are presented, it is considered that the report is of outstanding merit and usefulness to the Department. It has been given the grade of "Excellent."

Mr. Service, who is now in Washington, has been informed of this commendation of his work.

Very truly yours,

(JGE)

(For the Secretary of State).

CA: ASC: MS.  
1/4/45.

EXHIBIT No. 9

CHUNGKING, CHINA, May 10, 1945.

Subject: Letter of commendation.

To: The honorable the Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

Mr. John S. Service is highly commended for outstanding aid rendered Headquarters, United States Forces, China Theater, in advising the Commanding General on political matters which have direct and important bearing on the military situation in China. Mr. Service was influential in the establishment of a Military Observer Group in Yen-an, accompanying the initial group there himself. His thorough knowledge of Chinese customs and language enabled him to develop and maintain cordial relations with Mao Tse-tung, Chu Teh, and other Communist leaders. During his extended residence in Yen-an he wrote a great number of detailed reports on military, economic, and political conditions in areas under Communist control, a field in which the American Government had previously had almost no reliable information. He prepared valuable analyses of the political situation as it affected the war potential of the Chinese Government and by correlation that of the United States Forces in China.

In recognition of his outstanding performance of duty, the Commanding General, U. S. Forces, China Theater, expresses to Mr. Service the appreciation of the United States Forces in China.

A. C. WEDEMEYER,  
Lieutenant General, U. S. A., Commanding.

EXHIBIT No. 10

Standard Form No. 64

OFFICE MEMORANDUM—UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Date: June 16, 1947

To: FP—Mr. G. Ackerson, Jr.  
From: BC—Mr. E. T. Wailes.  
Subject: John S. Service.

I quote the following excerpt from a personal letter received by Mr. Richards from the Minister to New Zealand, Avra Warren:

"Service is doing a splendid job of work and is moving among people in an eminently desirable way. While he has only made a few public addresses so far, he presents himself in an entirely representative manner. His remarks at the Memorial Day service held at the Anglo-Cathedral in Wellington, with the Prime Minister present, were so well phrased and had such widespread support they were carried in the editorial space of the not so friendly Wellington Evening Post."

We agree with Mr. Warren that John Service is doing an outstanding job as First Secretary of the Legation at Wellington.

T. W.  
E. T. WAILES.

A. L. R.  
BC: A.L.Richards: vg.

## EXHIBIT No. 11

APRIL 1, 1949.

Mr. DONALD W. SMITH,

*Chief, Division of Foreign Service Personnel, Department of State.*

DEAR MR. SMITH: On the eve of my departure from the States, I wish to express my appreciation at having been given the valuable experience of serving on a Selection Board, and to express my high regard for the performance and ability and character of the other members of Selection Board "B" 1949. Dr. Gordon A. Craig of Princeton University was an almost ideal public member, bringing to his task a profound knowledge of international affairs and the importance therein of a competent Foreign Service.

Foreign Service Officers Clarence C. Brooks, Parker T. Hart, and John S. Service were also ideal. Brooks, with his long service experience and wide acquaintance, his common sense and spirit of justice, was very helpful to the Board in its deliberations.

Both Hart and Service worked almost double time in their determination to insure that the Board would give a correct and just rating to the Foreign Service officers available for promotion and in studying and drafting recommendations which might be helpful to FP and the Board of Foreign Service for improving the work of future Selection Boards.

These three men are splendid types of the American Foreign Service Officer.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD R. HEATH,  
*American Minister to Bulgaria.*

## EXHIBIT No. 12

APRIL 4, 1949.

JOHN S. SERVICE, Esquire,

*American Foreign Service Officer,**% Department of State, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SERVICE: I wish to thank you for the work which you completed as a member of the 1949 Foreign Service Selection Board B.

In choosing the members of the Selection Boards, the Office of the Foreign Service was fully aware that the arduous and exacting nature of the work that would confront them, and its supreme importance, constituted a challenge to the best that the Service could produce in the way of intelligence, fairmindedness, and a realistic grasp of personnel problems. I am happy to say that you met this challenge with complete success.

The very existence of a career service such as ours is dependent upon the confidence of its members in the absolute fairness and utter impartiality of the manner in which promotions are made in it. You and your colleagues on the 1949 Selection Boards have done much to enhance that confidence, and you have earned the gratitude of the entire Foreign Service Officer corps.

Sincerely yours,

CHRISTIAN M. RAVNAL,  
*Director General of the Foreign Service.*

OFS:FP:SHBrowne:mgc.

## EXHIBIT No. 13

Copy: ap.

GRAND LODGE OF FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS OF CHINA,

April 18, 1950.

The Honorable, the CHAIRMAN OF THE LOYALTY SECURITY BOARD,  
*Department of State, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: As an American-born Chinese, I have known for some thirty years Mr. and Mrs. Robert Roy Service, parents of the Hon. John Stewart Service, and also him for over ten years in the United States and in China.

The late Mr. Robert R. Service was for probably two decades a secretary of the International Committee of Y. M. C. A.'s (headquarters in New York) and served most of that time as a Y. M. C. A. secretary in West China and Shanghai. He had traveled widely in all parts of China, beloved by thousands of Chinese of

all classes, Christian and non. My family and I have been for many years intimates of the Service family in Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., Church and Masonic activities in China. In all these organizations, both father and son, the Services, showed sympathetic understanding, and had a genius for friendship with the Chinese people, especially with the underprivileged. These qualities characterize the whole Service family. I had come to know Robert and John Service quite closely in community church and Masonic lodges, and admire them for their genuine humanitarian spirit, their devotion to the Protestant missionary enterprise in China and their love of the Masonic Craft.

I write this unsought testimonial, Sir, not just as a gesture of confidence in a brother Mason, nor yet as a friend of Mr. John S. Service and his truly Christian family, but fundamentally as one who keenly appreciates his character to be utterly alien to anything approaching Communist leanings, for I am firmly convinced that his proud educational, cultural, family, and religious background and professional career negate everything Communism stands for. I feel it is due to Mr. Service, as well as to your Board, interested in ascertaining the facts of that background, that I address you, for that background speaks louder than words his loyalty to his country and the Protestant faith, of which all the Services have been such outstanding exponents all their lives.

Very respectfully,

Dr. H. C. Mei.

HCM: JMT.

EXHIBIT No. 14

*March 1937*

Frederick V. Field	Owen Lattimore
Phillip J. Jaffe	Cyrus H. Peake
T. A. Bisson	Robert K. Reischauer
Ch'ao-ting Chi	William T. Stone
Kenneth W. Colegrove	Hester Lorn

*March 1940*

Frederick V. Field	Owen Lattimore
Phillip J. Jaffe	William W. Lockwood
T. A. Bisson	Kate Mitchell
Lillian Peffer	Cyrus H. Peake
Ch'ao-ting Chi	David H. Popper
Kenneth W. Colegrove	William T. Stone

*March 1941*

Frederick V. Field	William W. Lockwood
Phillip J. Jaffe	Kate Mitchell
T. T. Bisson	David H. Popper
Kenneth W. Colegrove	William T. Stone
Owen Lattimore	

*March 1942*

Frederick V. Field	Kate Mitchell
T. A. Bisson	G. Nye Steiger
Kenneth W. Colegrove	Harold M. Vinacke
William W. Lockwood	Benjamin H. Kizer

*March 1943*

Frederick V. Field	Kate Mitchell
Phillip J. Jaffe	G. Nye Steiger
T. A. Bisson	Harold M. Vinacke
Kenneth W. Colegrove	Benjamin H. Kizer
William W. Lockwood	Harriet Moore

*January 1944*

Phillip J. Jaffe	Kate Mitchell
------------------	---------------

EXHIBIT 15

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
AMERICAN EMBASSY

102.91/G-349.

No. 218.

STOCKHOLM, June 3, 1949.

Unclassified.

Rec'd Jun. 13. Action Labor Enc. Info. FR. ITP. EUR. C.

Subject: Transmittal of Swedish text of 1949 agreement and English text of 1948 agreement with changes.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE, *Washington.*

Sir: I have the honor to refer to the Department's A-102 dated April 16, 1949, and A-144 dated May 27, 1949, requesting text of agreement reached between Swedish Shipowners' Association and Swedish Seaman's Union, March 1949, and to transmit the Swedish text of the 1949 agreement and the English text of the 1948 agreement with marginal notations of all changes from the 1948 to the 1949 agreements.

This Embassy has had repeated assurances from the offices in Gothenburg that the English text of the 1949 agreement would be in our hands shortly. Copies will be forwarded in quantity as soon as possible.

Respectfully yours,

HUGH S. CUMMING, Jr.,  
*Counselor of Embassy,*  
(For the Ambassador).

Enclosures:

1948 Agreement between Swedish Shipowners' and Seamen's Union  
1949 Avtal Mellan Sveriges Redareförening och Svenska Sjöfolksförbundet

GA Peterson:rep.

File No. 560.1.

DE.

Action copy. Return to DC/R files within 14 days, with a notation of action taken.

AB.

EXHIBIT No. 16

Unclassified.

No. 13.

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,  
*Tientsin, China, April 12, 1950.*

Subject: Accounting Transactions of American Consulate General, Tientsin.

123 Wellborn, Alfred-T.

17 Rec'd May 16. Action FE. Info. DCR. DS. DF. CS/P. CS. c.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,

*Washington.*

Sir: I have the honor to refer to this Consulate General's despatch no. 11, March 17, 1950 entitled "Final Accounting Transactions of American Consulate General, Tientsin."

At the time despatch no. 11 was written it was believed that the last remaining American member of the staff of this Consulate General would have left Tientsin by the afternoon of March 17. However, two hours before my scheduled embarkation, the local authorities revoked my exit permit because of a claim made on March 16 by the People's Government to certain furniture in the United States Government premises here (see despatch no. 14, April 12, 1950). The settlement of this issue took to April 8 and during that period certain additional transactions occurred.

As the duration of my enforced stay in Tientsin was indefinite and depended entirely on the length of time necessary to come to terms with the local authorities, the arrangement made with the British Consulate General, Tientsin, for payment of last minute expenditures of this Consulate General was continued. This arrangement was made inasmuch as the accounts of Disbursing Officer Gordon Tullock were closed March 13 preparatory to his departure which actually took place early on the morning of March 15. As I was to have left on March 17, it was deemed preferable not to transfer to me the accounts for such a short period.

Bills paid in behalf of this Consulate General by the British Consulate General, supported by vouchers and signed receipts, will be presented to the Department for settlement through the British Foreign Office.

There has also been in this period a number of receipts of funds obtained from the sale of United States Government property. A tabulation of these transactions is as follows:

EXHIBIT No. 17

See transcript of proceeding for afternoon of May 27, 1950, commencing at page 81.

EXHIBIT No. 18

SERVICE

1. 5-14-42. Chungking.  
Two memos.  
The first is solely report to Con. Gen. of conversation.  
Second is a similar report but with some interpretive comment, which is factual and does not reveal bias.  
Subject of both memos is the "Chinese Industrial Cooperatives."
2. 7-24-42. Chungking.  
Despatch (called for) on propaganda and psychological warfare by Chinese Gov't.  
Generally factual and detailed. Received commendation from Dep't. Repeats some Communist criticism of Chinese Government organs, which was probably accurate, as commies have generally been perceptive and keen as critics of others, even when (and especially when) they were guilty of the same things, or worse.
3. 1-23-43.  
Memo prepared in Dep't. A key document.  
This is a thoughtful and well-written memo, pointing to the danger of impending civil war in China, from both military and political standpoints. While it relays, perhaps somewhat naively, certain Communist suggestions for bettering the situation, it does not recommend that these suggestions be accepted and followed up. On the contrary, it recommends that U. S. officials be detailed to the Communist-held area to provide the answers to a number of questions concerning the Communists and conditions in the area they hold. There was obviously no intent to influence the Government along pro-Communist lines, for the author complains that such information as is available stemmed in part from journalists "who appear to have a bias favorable to the Communists." And he warns against any brief visits during which our representatives "would be under the influence of official guides."
4. 2-11-43.  
Innerdepartmental memo drafted by S. and Smyth. Repeats briefly warning of unfavorable course of events in China and points out that "one possible course of action" might be sending U. S. representatives to Communist areas. Warns that Chinese Gov't will probably not sanction this, but will be resentful if it is done without its consent.
5. 8-6-43.  
Despatch from Lanchow.  
Called for report on Gold Market and Trading. Purely factual. No political implications.
6. 8-6-43. Lanchow.  
Reporting experiences of an American agricultural expert. Completely nonpolitical. Points out exaggerated hopes for Chinese government organs for U. S. aid and tendency to enlist that aid even when they have no real need for it.
7. 8-16-43. Lanchow.  
Reporting forced organization of professional people in Lanchow, for purposes of extortion and political supervision. Unsparing of Party, but factual. Essentially nonpolitical.

8. 8-17-43. Lanchow.  
On evidences of anti-Russian and anti-communist feeling in Chinese officialdom. Seems to be purely factual. In describing the restrictions placed upon the local Soviet consul, Service was perhaps unaware that this sort of treatment had been accepted general practise in the Soviet Union for at least a decade. Nevertheless, despatch contains no statement condemning Chinese Gov't for this treatment.
9. 8-17-43. Lanchow.  
Service states that Soviet diplomatic representative has been very friendly to himself and to Capt. Tolstoy "and has been willing to discuss general problems with an openness and apparent frankness rather unusual for our Russian colleagues". Otherwise, report contains no independent comment by Service, and is restricted to a recounting of the views expressed by the Soviet representative.
10. 8-18-43. Lanchow.  
Military notes. Purely factual. Describes deplorable state of Chinese troops passing through city, and brutality with which they were treated; but description is impassive, and without independent comment.
11. 8-18-43. Lanchow.  
A report on political unrest and banditry in Kansu. Little relation to communists. Report is detailed and factual.
12. 8-19-43.  
Embassy at Chungking refers in a despatch to certain of Service's reports. No comment on communists involved. Service speculates on Chinese Government's plans with respect to communists. No bias apparent.
13. 8-20-43. Lanchow.  
On reception of U. S. broadcasts in Kansu. Factual and objective. A long report on activities of local Chinese police with regard to foreigners: restrictions of movement, observation, curiosity, suspicion, etc. Speaks of Chinese police using "Russian treatment of aliens as a model."
115. 9-10-43. Stilwell mission.  
Reporting statements made to Stilwell by Chinese (Nationalist) General, obviously sympathetic to communists. No independent comment. Views expressed by General are somewhat similar to those expressed by Service in item 3.
116. 9-23-43. Chungking.  
Two interpretative memos by Service concerning Eleventh Plenary Session of the Fifth Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang. The memos subject the decisions of the gathering to a searching and skeptical scrutiny, but the conclusions were borne out by subsequent events.  
(Note.—These memos should be compared with communist publicity at the time).
117. 9-29-43. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Describes the circumstances of the withdrawal of the communist representative from a meeting of the People's Political Council, as represented by a communist source. Service adds no comment of his own.
118. 10-27-43. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Memo asserting, and stating reasons why Chinese public opinion will be offended if Burma campaign is not soon inaugurated. No apparent relation to communist problem.
119. 10-28-43. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Describes the bickering and bad blood between the Government and the minority groups over the composition of the Committee for the Establishment of Constitutional Government. Report is objective and describes the Committee as "not a bad one; but states that "it is a rather unfortunate omen that the committee is starting its existence with a background of petty and acrimonious politics."
120. 11-13-43. Stilwell. (Military report).  
Report on "willingness of Chinese Military leaders to become puppets." An important memo, which should be compared with communist line of the same period. Service rejects the communist thesis that the Kuomintang was encouraging defection to the Japanese-occupied area in order to improve their prospects for combatting the communists after the war. Says this is the result rather than the design. Says

- large-scale defections are due primarily to Chiang's policy of placing in front line war-lord forces which are of doubtful loyalty to himself and which, being mercenaries from the beginning, are naturally amenable to Japanese promises of better pay and treatment.
121. 2-2-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Unimportant. Relaying of report that airport construction is causing discontent in a certain district.
122. 2-3-44.  
Memo from Kuomintang source about conspiracy against Chiang. Questions Kuomintang tendency to blame communists.
123. 2-15-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Also about plot against Chiang. Adduces further proof that plot existed, and that it was an Inner-army affair.
124. 2-15-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
A further report about the dissatisfaction caused by airport construction and Government's policies concerning compensation to land owners and conscription of labor. Factual.
125. 2-21-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Giving background on certain feelers for direct negotiations between Government and communists. Factual. Reflects, like all of this reporting, good contacts in the communist camp.
126. 2-21-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Reporting information released to correspondent by Government on extent of Jap-controlled area. Points out that Government spokesman listed certain communist-controlled areas as entirely Jap-controlled, evidently communist domination the more humiliating. Service points to this as indication of bitterness now existing between two factions.
127. 2-16-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Reporting interview with Madame Sun-yat-sen. Factual.
128. 3-2-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Further report, detailed and objective, on Chinese unrest in Chengtu arising out of construction of U. S. air bases. It is evident that Chinese officials somewhere along the line are pocketing funds appropriated for compensation of conscripted labor, knowing that resulting bitterness will attach largely to Americans; but Service does not charge this directly.
129. 3-14-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Commentary on a report submitted by an OWI official from Kweilin. Contains following significant passage:  
"The war in China has stimulated political consciousness to the point where loose separatism, which is the goal of the provincialists and which will mean a return to the chaos of the early years of the Republic, is impossible. By present indications it *does not* seem likely that the existing Kuomintang Government will collapse during the war. But if the present conflict is followed, as *does* seem likely, by civil war \* \* \* out of this civil war \* \* \* there can be expected to emerge either a more progressive Kuomintang Government or a communist state, probably of the present modified Chinese communist type."
130. 3-14-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Another interview with Madame Sun Yat-Sen. Purely factual. No independent comment.
131. 3-17-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
An excellent analysis of T. V. Soong's position—thoughtful and objective—acknowledged with special commendation by the Department.
132. 3-14-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Commentary on another personal incident in the Chiang entourage. Extremely moderate in tone, ending with the suggestion that "the real importance of this story, and of the many similar ones regarding the misdoings of the Soong-Kang family, is the readiness of the public to believe them."
133. 3-14-44. Military.  
Review of second edition of Chiang's book—"China's Destiny." Points out changes since first edition. Severely critical of book ("a bigoted, narrow, strongly nationalistic effort at a special interpretation of history")—says that it reflects "unchanged a bitter anti-communist bias."



134. 3-24-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Memo on Chinese Territorial Claims in North Burma. Detailed, authoritative, analytical. "Chiang may have great ambition and vision. But his statesmanship does not ordinarily go far beyond shrewd, realistic, but often short-sighted bargaining."
135. 3-23-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Memo on the rumored plan to reduce China's armies. Service is skeptical about this.  
"China remains a country where life is valued very little, where corruption is deep-rooted and prevalent, where economics have been consistently ignored or not understood, where power derives from military strength and that strength is measured in numbers, where the interests and welfare of the people have not (except perhaps in Communist North China) been a concern of their rulers and where the basic, overriding consideration is the struggle for power."  
Discusses incident of bombing of Chinese forces in Sinkiang, obviously by planes having something to do with the Soviet Union. Reflects a certain naïveté about Soviet Union in assumption that Soviet Kazakhs might have taken initiative in Sinkiang and that Soviet Government might have been "willing to lend a little unofficial assistance."
137. 3-23-44. Military.  
Reporting views of Chiang Kai-shek; critical of Chiang's attitude but offers explanation for it. Concludes Chiang is responsible for situation in China and will continue in his present ways until the U. S. formulates and applies a strong China policy. Analysis appears objective and unbiased. (Chiang mentions *Amerasia*.)
138. 3-22-44. Military.  
More about bombing incident in Sinkiang. Warns against U. S. involvement, particularly if we want to run convoy through that area.
139. 4-5-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
More on bombing incident. Without particular interest.
140. 3-26-44. Military.  
Transmitting report prepared by Englishman who had been residing in communist area.
141. 4-4-44. Military.  
Memorandum. Miscellaneous news items. Purely factual.
142. 4-21-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Chungking Embassy despatch transmitting memo on situation in Sinkiang. Specially commended by Department. Objective analysis of Chinese Nationalist Government's motives in the Sinkiang incidents and the success of the move. Service's recommendations include: "We should make every effort to learn what the Russian aims in Asia are. A good way of gaining material relevant to this will be a careful first-hand study of the strength, attitudes, and popular support of the Chinese communists. But in determining our policy toward Russia in Asia we should avoid being swayed by China. The initiative must be kept firmly in our hands." . . . "Chiang unwittingly may be contributing to Russian dominance in Eastern Asia by internal and external policies which, if pursued in their present form, will render China too weak to serve as a possible counterweight to Russia. By doing so, Chiang may be digging his own grave; not only North China and Manchuria, but also national groups such as Korea and Formosa may be driven into the arms of the Soviets."
143. 4-17-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Transmitting text of an interview with General Lung Yun. No comments.
144. 4-21-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Memo reporting views held by leaders of some of the minor parties of China. Service's comments relate only to the relative importance of these minor parties and are purely factual.
145. 5-18-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Service's critique of a Military Intelligence Dispatch. Objectively points out fallacies in the MI dispatch. Outlines activities of Nationalist Government in attempting to discredit the Communists in a purely factual manner. Makes three points: (1) that there is a fundamental conflict between Communists and Japanese and puppets;

- (2) Kuomintang is attempting to convince foreign opinion that Communists are in league with Japs and puppets; (3) that Kuomintang actually is in contact with Japs and expects puppet support. Justifies his points factually. (Rated Very Good in Department.)
146. 5-20-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Memo on plan to bring Chinese-American technicians to China. States objections to plan factually. Totally nonpolitical.
147. 5-20-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Memo offering possible drawbacks to U. S. Army plan to pay benefits to families of Chinese soldiers killed in Burma. Nonpolitical.
148. 5-23-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Memo recounting rumors of domestic trouble in the Chiang Household. Factual reporting.
149. 5-11-44. Military.  
Transmitting a speech of Chou En-Lai; summary without comment.
150. 5-12-44. Military.  
Memo on effects of Japanese victories in Honan. States objectively various interpretations which will be placed upon this in Chinese circles.
151. 5-24-44. Chungking. Stilwell. Military.  
Transmitting translation of statement of League of Democratic Parties. Summary without comment.
152. 5-25-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Recounting views of Lin Tsu-han, Chairman of Yenan Border Government. Presented without comment.
153. 5-25-44. Military.  
Transmitting information on the status of communist negotiations with the Central Government as received from the Communists. Presented without comment.
154. 5-31-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Factual account of an interview with Counselor of French Delegation at Chungking. Reported without comment of political nature.
155. 6-9-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Memo of interview with Marshal Feng Yu-hsiang, presenting Marshal's views without comment as to their validity. Purely factual.
156. 6-7-44. Military.  
Presentation of the views of David An on Chinese Treatment of Koreans. Reported without comment or interpretation.
157. 6-20-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Important memo, widely circulated with favorable comment in Department. Strong denunciation of the weakness, corruption, and venality of Kuomintang. Apparently written partly from exasperation at the Nationalist Government but criticism appears to be justified. Only political bias visible is that of American official trying to turn China into an asset to the American war effort. Encourages American contact with Communists as with other minor parties and liberal elements to stimulate the Kuomintang to a reform program. No interest displayed in Communism as a movement in itself. Contact with Communist areas desirable from an intelligence standpoint in the war effort. \* \* \* "We should select men of known liberal view to represent us in OWI, cultural relations and other lines of work in China."
158. 6-23-44. Military.  
Memo of conversation between Chiang Kai-shek and V. P. Wallace, J. C. Vincent, Gen. Ferris, Owen Lattimore, and JSS. Factual account.
159. 6-24-44. Military.  
Reporting communist agreement to the sending of a U. S. "observers' section" to Yenan. Objective report of communist views on the matter, presented without bias or comment.
160. 7-6-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Memo on communist map showing contraction of communist-held territory. Service cites contemporary Central Government map which contradicts Communist claim. Illustrates distortions of Central Government map and comments that communist map may not be more than generally true and may not give whole picture. Objective, without political coloration.

161. 7-11-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Memo transmitting a report from communist sources on communist military operations against Japan during May 1944. Relayed without evaluation although several Japanese news items are submitted in conjunction with the report as some possible confirmation of communist claims. No political implications.
162. 7-20-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Memo transmitting a personal letter from Chinese intellectual expressing disillusionment with present Chinese regime and hopes of constructive American aid. JSS feels letter reflects present state of mind of large part of Chinese intellectuals and liberals. Objective presentation, pointing out strength as well as weakness of viewpoint.
163. 7-21-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Transmitting a statement of Chinese intellectuals "Appeal for Revolutionary Democratic Rights." Covering memo indicates approval of intellectuals' denunciation of Kuomintang suppression of freedom of speech, thought, study, and expression.
164. 8-26-44. Chungking. Stilwell. Yenau.  
Memo of first impressions of Yenau. Is highly favorable in comparison with Kuomintang-held areas. "There is a bit of smugness, self-righteousness, and conscious fellowship" \* \* \* but "most modern place in China." "What is seen in Yenau is a well-integrated movement, with a political and economic program which it is successfully carrying out under competent leaders. \* \* \* One cannot help coming to feel that this movement is strong and successful and that it has such drive behind it and has tied itself so closely to the people that it will not easily be killed." Service understandably favorably impressed by comparison between Yenau and Kuomintang areas in matter of material conditions, morale, and efficiency.
165. 8-26-44. Chungking. Observer Section in Yenau.  
Memo of conversation with Mao Tse-Tung in Yenau in which Mao sounded Service on the possibility of opening an American consulate in Yenau. Factual reporting.
166. 9-1-44. Chungking. Observer Section in Yenau.  
Transmitting reports of interviews with various Chinese communist leaders. Factual.
167. 9-1-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Transmitting report of interview with Chief of Chinese General Staff. Factual account of diametrical opposition of views between communists and National Government.
168. 9-8-44. Chungking. Observer Section in Yenau.  
Important memo outlining Service's interpretation of communist motives. Inclines to think the best of communists. Offers arguments in opposition to this attitude but explains why he does not feel the opposing arguments are justifiable. Believes the CCP aims for orderly prolonged progress to eventual socialism, not violent revolution, and in achieving that aim will not seek an early monopoly of political power but considers first the long-term interests of China. Service shows a certain naiveté in his grasp of Marxist doctrine and ignorance of some changes incorporated in that doctrine during and after Lenin's time, e. g., that capitalist development is an unavoidable stage of economic development. Service believes the CCP will initiate (or had initiated) a type of NEP program which will last indefinitely into the future—ignoring or ignorant of the fate of NEP in the U. S. S. R. Appears to be an objective analysis of the situation. (The conclusions appear to be what might be expected from one judging on the basis of Chinese experience only, not with reference to experience with communist seizures of power elsewhere.) The Chungking Embassy takes issue with Service's views that the CCP is not aiming for a monopoly of power in the near future.
169. 8-29-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yenau.  
Memo reporting on economic conditions in communist-controlled North Shensi. Tone is favorable toward achievement but information is presented in factual manner without comment.
170. 9-19-44. Chungking. Observer Section in Yenau.  
Memo on *Chieh Fang Jih Pao*, communist newspaper in Yenau. Submitted without comment save that the paper was well edited and of high caliber. Unimportant.

171. 10-11-44. Chungking. Observer Section in Yen-an.  
Memo summarizing lectures given by the Communist General, Chief of Staff of 18th Group, to officers of U. S. Army Observers Section regarding the situation behind the enemy lines in North China. Service comments only on the fact that the communist army is a political army as much as it is military. Factual.
172. 9-21-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Report designating communist-controlled areas of China. No political comment.
173. 9-21-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Transmitting report of a reception given the Observers Section. No political comment. Unimportant.
174. 9-21-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Report on communist charges against Gen. Yen Hsi-shan. Details given factual without apparent bias.
175. 7-21-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Reporting on inauguration of daily news broadcasts from Yen-an. Purely factual.
176. 8-24-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Transmitting map of communist border area. No comments.
177. 9-8-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Well conceived analysis of the strength of the communist movement with the recommendation that American military aid be extended to the Communist forces, to aid in the struggle against Japan. Service expects the Kuomintang will object to such aid and stated the U. S. must soon formulate a policy to decide the question of this aid, keeping in mind that "the nature, policies and objectives of the CCP are of vital long-term concern to the U. S."; the "CCP under any circumstances must be counted a continuing and important influence in China." Arguments in favor of extending aid are presented factually. The interview with Mao transmitted with this dispatch indicates Service's views regarding the question of U. S. relationship with the CCP parallel to a certain extent those of Mao himself. Service specifies his reasons.
178. 10-11-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Memo of lecture by communist military leader on strength, distribution and arms of communist forces. Factual account.
179. 10-13-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Memo of lectures by communist military leader on operations of 8th Route Army. Factual account without comment other than to point out the importance the communists attach to political programs as the basis of their military strength and success.
180. 9-29-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Report on possible usefulness of old communist bases in Southeast China. Objective account of facts. Specifies in connection with communist reasoning on matter that "It would be a mistake to assume that the communist consideration of the problem is all on the high-minded and unselfish plane." No political bias apparent.
181. 10-2-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Memo on personal impressions of communist leaders. Highly favorable of the personal qualities of these men. (Strikingly like the impressions of the old Bolsheviks which foreign observers acquired at the time of the Russian Revolution). Service's favorable attitude obviously in part stems from the contrast with Kuomintang leaders. Apparently unaware of the potential dangerousness of the type of character molded in the communist school, especially when the CCP holds the reins of power. Objective in all.
182. 10-13-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Report on the popular appeal of the communist party. Outlines tactics employed by the communists which win popular support, i. e. reduced rents, elimination of banditry, popular election of officials, and converting the army from instrument of oppression to one of aid to peasantry. Service views the accomplishments with favor tempered with reserve. Can find no other explanation of popular backing of the communists. (NB. Service apparently consider "democracy" as synonymous with popular support, a definition which would apply to Hitler's regime as well. On basis of this definition, Service's opinion that the CCP is democratic is justifiable.)

183. 9-20-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Extremely well-balanced report on the development of communist political control in areas under their domination. (Rated Excellent in Department.) Report is well-rounded, presents a factual picture and appears to be very perceptive in divining the purpose of communist actions in many fields. Explains both how the communist program wins popular support and at the same time serves communist interests. No political bias evident and no effort to condemn or praise. Factual reporting. (Should be noted that CA's comments in Department on Service's reporting consistently put communist in quotation marks, implying something distinct from the Soviet brand. No evidence of this attitude has yet appeared in any of Service's work.)
184. 10-9-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Reports decision of CCP to change its name in foreign publicity to avoid the stigma of "communism." Service interprets it as a desire "to allay any foreign fears and to win foreign good-will." No political comment otherwise.
185. 10-25-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Transmitting communist views on treatment of Japan. No comment made but appears to be evident that Service accepts sincerity of communist spokesman and feels views expressed are honest aims of CCP.
186. 10-25-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Interview with CIC of communist military forces. Service states "I am in general agreement with the views expressed by such communist leaders as Gen. Chu. Every effort, however, has been made to avoid encouraging any high expectations, to point out the practical difficulties in the way of direct cooperation and to suggest that Japan may be defeated in other ways than as the communists insist, a slow process of liquidating the armies on the Asian mainland." Chu's views followed the usual pattern that cooperation with the Kuomintang was impossible and U. S. strong role necessary in China.
187. 9-27-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Report of interview with Hungarian national. No political content.
188. 9-28-44. Yen-an.  
Memo on the orientation of the Chinese communists toward the USSR and toward the U. S. Key document. Essentially, reasons that CCP orientation is exclusively pro-China. Ties with the USSR are of the past. Interests of the CCP are best served by cultivating ties with the U. S. which can aid the industrialization of China. USSR can't and China can't do it alone. Service states "I believe that the Chinese Communists are at present sincere in seeking Chinese unity on the basis of American support. This does not preclude their turning back toward Soviet Russia if they are forced to in order to survive American-supported Kuomintang attack." Service's account appears to be an eminently fair statement of communist views as evident at that time—his conclusions, a reasoned choice between the lesser of two evils. Reveals ignorance of some of the finer points of communist doctrine, particularly in regard to the manner in which Marxism is to be applied outside the USSR.
189. 10-1-44. Yen-an.  
Transmission of communist newspapers. No comments.
190. 10-25-44. Chungking. Observers Section in Yen-an.  
Memo on communist success in eliminating banditry. Cites communist explanation for this situation—economic improvement, mobilization of entire population in the war effort and removal of feudal basis of banditry—as only apparent explanation for its elimination. Objective reporting.
191. 11-24-44. Yen-an.  
Reports of imprisonments of American medical officer and several foreign correspondents on popular support in communist areas. Presented without comment.
192. 11-24-44. Yen-an.  
Transmission of memos on conditions in communist areas and on Communist-Kuomintang relations. Service's observations are, that the communists are fighting the Japanese, successfully because they have the people behind them mobilized. Mobilization based on economic, political and social revolution, gains of which the people will fight

to keep. Kuomintang will be unable to repress these mobilized people or the communists as long as the latter have popular support. Communists will continue to be important part of China's future and unless Kuomintang institutes extensive reforms (unlikely) Communists will be dominant force in China in a few years. Service's observations have been borne out by subsequent events.

183. 10-10-44. Chungking. Stilwell.  
Important memo on need for realism in U. S. relations with Chiang. Anti-Chiang, not pro-communist. Holds Kuomintang dependent on U. S., U. S. not dependent on Kuomintang. We do not need it militarily, we do not need to fear its opposition or fall or its international importance. Chiang does not represent pro-American or democratic groups, we owe him no gratitude and he understands only force. Need hard-boiled policy toward him to aid U. S. war effort. Only reference made to communists is that "we cannot hope to solve China's problems without consideration of the opposition forces, Communist, Provincial, and liberal." Service's denunciation is strong but based exclusively on the urgency of aiding the American war effort in the Pacific. No indication of political bias towards any faction, only against Kuomintang corruption and power politics. A tendency to underplay usefulness of Kuomintang to the U. S. war effort and discount any worth in the movement.
194. 10-10-44. Yen-an.  
Memo on communist interception of State Department radio bulletin. No political comments.
195. 11-24-44. Yen-an.  
Memo on present communist attitude toward relations with Kuomintang. Service displays great insight into tactics of communists in increasing demands as the situation turns more in their favor. Reveals acute observation and understanding of the power politics involved. No personal comments of political nature appended.
196. 10-15-44. Yen-an.  
Memo regarding censorship of escape stories coming out of communist territory. Unimportant.
197. 10-17-44. Yen-an.  
Memo transmitting the published policies and administrative program of the CCP. No comments.
198. 10-18-44. Yen-an.  
Memo on communist propaganda use of statements of foreign correspondents. Deplores the extravagant statements made by some promising American aid to the communists, but comments on the fact that many correspondents have been converted to a pro-communist attitude. Unimportant.
199. 10-21-44. Yen-an.  
Transmitting communist newspapers. No comments.
200. 11-8-44. Washington.  
Interrogation of Service while on consultation in Washington. Views on Japanese communists. Appears to be purely factual information. Service states that he himself helped carry information for Japanese communists, apparently out of Yen-an to Chungking for relay elsewhere. No elaboration.
201. 11-44. Washington.  
Interrogation of Service on Washington consultation. Views on probable developments in North China in the event of a U. S. landing. States that communists will cooperate with allied troops as long as allies do not interfere with their politics. Will not allow military considerations to prejudice their political program. Service suggests however "that it would be well to put out a rather large number of U. S. officers," since the communist area is decentralized. Chiefly factual evaluations.
202. 11-8-44. Washington.  
Interrogation of Service while on Washington consultation. Predominantly factual information. Service states "China's first need is economic development, and U. S. must do it. Russian help would divide China, but U. S. will unite them." \* \* \* "Chinese communists are not radical at present. They are still Marxists, but are against subjectivism. Marxism points to ideal socialism." Little political comment.

203. 2-12-45. Chungking—for Wedemeyer.  
Military only.
204. 2-14-45. Chungking—for Wedemeyer.  
Memo on military weakness of our Far Eastern policy. States recommendations to aid communists parallel Churchill's policy in Yugoslavia, aiding the faction which would assist most in the war effort. Support of Chiang is only a means to an end but we tend to confuse the means with the end. We must clarify issue to restore our primary objective, defeat of Japan with smallest possible loss of life. Well-constructed analysis of situation.
205. 2-14-45. Chungking.  
Recount of the current status of Kuomintang-Communist negotiations. Purely factual reporting.
206. 2-16-45. Chungking.  
Views of Russian officials in China. No comments.
207. 2-17-45. Chungking.  
Memo on Kuomintang hopes to make a deal with Russia. Service's opinions are contradicted by later events but analysis is interesting. Feels USSR will not deal with Kuomintang in view of its decided objections to the regime, no likely quid pro quo exists and besides Chinese Communists are stronger than Kuomintang. Unaware that USSR would be willing to sacrifice interests of a local communist party for Soviet interests.
208. 2-17-45. Chungking.  
View of Sun Fo. No comments or analysis.
209. 2-19-45. Chungking.  
Memo on Chinese feelers regarding Formosa. Purely factual.
210. 8-28-45. Chungking.  
Criticism of proposal to declare Shanghai an open city. Military interest primarily. Good analysis. No political application.
211. 2-28-45. Chungking.  
Views of Captain (Joseph) Alsop. Diametrically opposed to Service's opinions. Alsop argued on the line that U. S. long-range interests were more important than the immediate ones of winning the war; that long-range interests involved allying China on our side as a balance against Soviet influence—our greatest threat—and destruction of the Chinese communists. Believed in necessity of getting involved in the inevitable civil war which would follow from U. S. complete backing of Kuomintang against communists.
212. 3-4-45. Chungking. Military.  
Request to visit Yen-an. No political coloration.
213. 3-21-45. Chungking.  
Memo of communist attitude toward Central Government. Notes change in CCP attitude toward U. S. cooperation in China and possibility of cooperation with Kuomintang. Service notes this change dates from Stilwell's departure. Communist expansions southward followed belief that U. S. would support only Chiang. Notes communists seem to be expecting large-scale Japanese activity in North China and are getting out of way of these Japanese efforts to consolidate on mainland. Communist determination to control China proper growing.
214. 3-13-45. Yen-an.  
Views of Mao Tse-tung. Factual reporting. Opinions similar to those expressed in earlier papers.
215. 3-14-45. Yen-an.  
Memo on communist expectations of Soviet aid and participation in the Pacific war at a late date. Probable course of military tactics to be followed by communists. Notes that communists will strive to gain control of Manchuria, that they have already infiltrated the area, because of its industrial importance. (Feeling that CCP did not expect USSR to strip Manchuria, as CCP intended to have benefits of its industrial potential.) Factual analysis.
216. 3-16-45. Yen-an.  
Transmission of communist views regarding Sinkiang. Relayed without comment.
217. 3-16-45. Yen-an.  
Communist views on Mongolia. Transmitted without comment.

218. 3-16-45. Yenau.  
Policy of the Chinese communists toward the problem of national minorities. Service states that while communists claim their program is based on Sun Yat-Sen's, in actuality it is based directly on that of the Russian communists (from whom Sun got most of his ideas). Service feels that some of these ideas (Stalin's "Marxism and National Question") may be unworkable in China because some of China's minority nations exist close to other strong states and because China is weaker than Russia was at time of 1917 revolution.
219. 3-17-45. Yenau.  
Communist plans for a relief and rehabilitation organization in communist liberated areas. No comments. Purely factual.
220. 3-17-45. Yenau.  
Evidence to substantiate communist claims as to the extent of territory under their control. American observers evidence. No political comment. Purely factual reporting.
221. 3-19-45. Yenau.  
Comments on communist report of Kuomintang exile government organizations in parts of China. Analysis of moves shows no political bias. Factual reporting.
222. 3-20-45. Yenau.  
Transmitting information regarding dealings of Chinese Central Government military official with the Japanese. No political coloration evident.
223. 3-21-45. Yenau.  
Memo on Chian Kai-shek's treatment of the Kwangsi Clique. Decidedly critical of Chiang's activities. Service's interpretation not necessarily accurate—CA disputes some points. Memo involves no mention of our references to communist movement. Factual reporting.
224. 3-22-45. Yenau.  
Significance of personnel appointments made by Chiang. Service interprets these appointments are signs that Chiang is preparing for civil war with the communists, rather than peaceful cooperation. Factual.
225. 3-23-45. Yenau.  
Memo on contact between the Chinese communists and Moscow. Service's interpretation is good. Gives known facts and distinguishes between governmental contacts and contact between communist parties. Appears to be a realistic view of situation. Service feels communists probably do not have relations with Soviet Government but contact between the Soviet CP and the Chinese is likely to exist.
226. 4-1-45. Yenau.  
Statement of communist policy to be adopted by the communist congress as given by Mao and other leaders. Offered without political observations other than to point out highlights.
227. 3-18-45. Yenau.  
Memo on establishment of unified labor organizations and women's groups for the communist liberated areas. Factual account with comment that this step constituted a direct challenge to the Central Government, almost bringing the future conflict into the open. No political bias evident.

## EXHIBIT No. 19

[Doc. 327]

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS, INCORPORATED

1 EAST 54TH STREET, NEW YORK 22, N. Y.

*Membership Card of*

Mr. JOHN S. SERVICE,  
American Consulate General  
Calcutta, India

For year ending February 1951.  
Amount \$15.00.

DONALD B. STRAUS, *Treasurer.*

Per TILLIE S. SLADE,

*Assistant Treasurer.**This card serves as your receipt*



## EXHIBIT No. 20

## THE STATE DEPARTMENT ESPIONAGE CASE

(By Emmanuel S. Larsen)

## WHO IS LARSEN?

Emmanuel Sigurd Larsen was catapulted into the international limelight early in June 1945, when as an official of the State Department he was one of the six arrested by the FBI under the provisions of the Espionage Act. Born in 1897 in San Rafael, California, of Danish parentage, Larsen was taken to China in 1906 by his father who went there to teach at the Imperial University in Chengtu. After a boyhood in China, Larsen completed his college education in Copenhagen. Returning to China he spent nearly twenty years in private and government service. Back in the United States in 1935, he soon joined the Office of Naval Intelligence in Washington as a civilian expert on Far Eastern affairs.

Behind the now-famous State Department Espionage Case, involving the arrest of six persons of whom I was one, an arrest which shocked the nation on June 7, 1945, is the story of a highly organized campaign to switch American policy in the Far East from its long-tested course to the Soviet line. It is a story which has never been told before in full. Many sensational though little-explained developments, such as the General Stilwell Affair, the resignation of Undersecretary Joseph C. Grew and Ambassador Patrick Hurley and the emergence of a pro-Soviet bloc in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, are interlaced with the Case of the Six, as the episode became known.

I have devoted many months to a plodding investigation of the case in which I had become entangled, primarily to rehabilitate my reputation and to establish my complete innocence. I have collaborated with Congressman George Dondero of Michigan, who sponsored the creation of the House Committee which is about to undertake an inquiry into all the circumstances of the disposition of the State Department Espionage Case, and have offered my fullest cooperation to the chairman of that committee, Congressman Samuel Hobbs. In the course of my own explorations, I have uncovered sufficient material to convince me that further probing into the matter might assume proportions even more far-reaching than those of the Pearl Harbor Investigation.

It is the mysterious whitewash of the chief actors of the Espionage Case which the Congress has directed the Hobbs Committee to investigate. But from behind that whitewash there emerges the pattern of a major operation performed upon Uncle Sam without his being conscious of it. That operation vitally affects our main ramparts in the Pacific. In consequence of this operation General Marshall was sent on a foredoomed mission to China designed to promote Soviet expansion on our Asiatic frontier. It was a mission which could not but come to grief and which may yet bring untold sorrow to the American people.

How did it happen that the United States began to turn in 1944 upon its loyal ally, the Chiang Kai-shek Government, which had for seven years fought Japan, and to assume the sponsorship of the rebel Communist regime which collaborated with the Japanese during the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact?

How did it come to pass that Washington since 1944 has been seeking to foist Communist members upon the sole recognized and legitimate government of China, a maneuver equivalent to an attempt by a powerful China to introduce Earl Browder and William Z. Foster into key positions in the United States government?

How did it transpire that our top-ranking military leader, General Marshall, should have promoted an agreement in China under which American officers would be training and equipping rebel Chinese Communist units at the very time when they were ambushing our marines and when Communists the world over were waging a war of nerves upon the United States?

Whose was the hand which forced the sensational resignation of Undersecretary of State Joseph C. Grew and his replacement by Dean Acheson? And was the same hand responsible for driving Ambassador Patrick Hurley into a blind alley and retirement?

The answers to all of these questions came to me as I unraveled the main threads of the tangled State Department Espionage Case. But many more questions still remain to be solved.

On June 7, 1945, while a tense nation was entering upon the climax of the war with Japan, and exactly five weeks before the atomic bomb was dropped upon

Hiroshima, our country was shaken by an announcement from Washington: the FBI had the previous night arrested on charges of violating the Espionage Act two State Department officials, one Naval Intelligence officer and three New York Journalists.

I was arrested in my home in Washington the evening of June 6, after a hard day's work in the State Department where I was employed as a research expert in Chinese affairs. When two FBI agents knocked at the door of our modest apartment as I sat down to dinner with my wife Theima and our little daughter Linda, I could not believe it and thought it was some sort of a joke when they informed me that I was under arrest.

The search of my home lasted late into the night, and it provided the saddest hours of our lives. After a gruelling interrogation, I was brought, still in a state of utter bewilderment, to the office of the United States Commissioner.

There I found myself sitting next to John Stewart Service, a leading figure in the pro-Soviet group in the China Section of the State Department, and to Lieut. Andrew Roth, liaison officer between the Office of Naval Intelligence and the State Department, whom I also knew as an adherent of pro-Soviet policies. Both of them were arrested separately the same night in Washington.

In New York that night of June 6 three other arrests were made simultaneously. Philip Jacob Jaffe, publisher and editor of the obscure magazine *Amerasia*, specializing in Far Eastern affairs, was picked up after a raid on his offices. At the same time Kate Louise Mitchell, coeditor of *Amerasia*, a companion and intimate collaborator of Jaffe's for years, was put under arrest. Another colleague of Jaffe, the journalist Mark Julius Gayn, a contributor on the Far East to *Amerasia* and leading national magazines, was also taken into custody in New York.

The search in the offices of *Amerasia* yielded a trove of more than 100 files containing, according to Congressman Dondero, top secret and highly confidential papers stolen from the State Department, War Department, Navy Department, Office of Strategic Services, Office of Postal and Telegraph Censorship, and the OWI at a time when we were at war with both Germany and Japan. Mr. Dondero described some of these documents before the House of Representatives on April 18th last as follows:

"First. One document marked 'secret' and obviously originating in the Navy Department dealt with the schedule and the targets for the bombing of Japan. This particular document was known to be in the possession of Philip Jaffe during the early spring of 1945 and before the program had been effected. That information in the hands of our enemies could have cost us many precious American lives.

"Second. Another document, marked 'top secret' and likewise originating in the Navy Department, dealt with the disposition of the Japanese fleet subsequent to the major naval battle of October 1944 and gave the location and class of each Japanese warship.

"Third. Another document, stolen from the Office of Postal and Telegraph Censorship, was a secret report on the Far East and so stamped as to leave no doubt in anybody's mind that the mere possession of it by an unauthorized person was a clear violation of the Espionage Act.

"Fourth. Another document was stolen from the Office of Military Intelligence and consisted of 22 pages containing information obtained from Japanese prisoners of war. When our military officials question prisoners of war, it is for the purpose of getting secret military information of the enemy's plans.

"Fifth. Another stolen document, particularly illuminating, and of present great importance to our policy in China, was a lengthy detailed report showing complete disposition of the units in the army of Chiang Kai-shek, where located, how placed, under whose command, naming the units, division by division, and showing their military strength. It is easy to visualize the consequences of this information in the hands of the Communist forces in China, then and now."

As disclosed by Congressman Dondero, one of the documents was "of such exceptional military importance and so closely guarded in its limited transmission that it was delivered personally into the hands of the Chief of the Office of Naval Intelligence." Many of the confidential papers bore this imprint:

"This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, 50, United States Code 31-32, as amended. Its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law."

In the offices of *Amerasia*, which boasted a total circulation of 1,700, the government agents found a large photocopying department, the operation of which,

according to Congressman Dondero, could not possibly have been an essential part of the business of such a limited publication. "This department," stated Mr. Dondero, "was working through the night, in the small hours of morning and even on Sundays." Where these photostats went and how far they traveled is one of the several pivotal mysteries awaiting solution in the whole case.

Probably not one informed American in 20,000 had ever heard of *Amerasia*. But those of us who had to do with research or policy-making in the field of our international relations in Asia were well aware of the potent influence this almost unknown publication exercised upon the conduct of American foreign policy.

The magazine first came to my attention during my employment as an analyst in Chinese affairs in the Office of Naval Intelligence, where I had served for about nine years from October 1935, to September 1944. After having spent nearly twenty-five years of my life in China, where my father was a university instructor and where I grew up and mastered Chinese like a native, I returned to the United States. Before entering the government service, I did post-graduate work at the University of Chicago and later at Columbia University on a Rockefeller scholarship.

It was during the war, while working in the Office of Naval Intelligence as a civilian, that circumstances led me unsuspectingly to my fateful meeting with Philip Jaffe, the dominant figure in the Espionage Case.

One of the officers I had met in the Far Eastern branch of the Naval Intelligence was a brilliant young man, Andrew Roth, who had been commissioned a junior lieutenant after completing a special course in the Japanese language. My friendship with Roth, who was a youth of 26, never became intimate. We frequently lunched together. Occasionally we met in the evening for a pot-luck dinner and a good argument.

Roth knew my special hobby, as did many of my associates and acquaintances. Ever since 1923 I had been collecting patiently from every conceivable source biographical data on Chinese personalities, military and political, and my file of several thousand cards contained off-the-record material about the careers of the chief figures in the great drama of modern China.

\* \* \*

One day Roth came to my desk in the Navy Department around noon time and asked me whether I had had my lunch. As I was free, I accepted his invitation to join him for a snack. While we walked up Pennsylvania Avenue, Roth asked me whether I knew Philip Jaffe, the publisher and editor of *Amerasia*. My answer being in the negative, he remarked that Jaffe was a friend of his and that he was interested in the biographies of Chinese leaders, so that the two of us should have a lot in common.

Roth suggested that I get together with Jaffe who was in a position to trade information with me about personalities. When asked how I could meet Jaffe, he smilingly informed me that Jaffe was in Washington that day, that he, Roth, was just then on his way to meet him for luncheon, and that he would be glad to take me along and introduce me.

We walked over to the Statler Hotel and met Jaffe in the lobby. First we had a cocktail in his room and then we had lunch in the restaurant. We discussed the conditions under which we could exchange information about Chinese leaders. Jaffe said that he visited Washington about once a month and that he would ask me on these visits for certain biographical material. If I didn't have it ready on my cards, I would prepare it for him and he would pick it up on his next trip. In return, he would supply me with information about the individuals I was studying. I was quite happy to have this new source of information, especially since I expected to get data on the Communist figures in China, a little-known field.

Most of the China experts in the Office of Naval Intelligence were satisfied with the superficial and generally negligible official biographies, whereas what I sought for my collection was the "dirt" about a man's career, the unpublished facts about his past and the real reasons for his switching from one faction to another. I had a hard time explaining to my superiors the importance of collecting such data about China, which was governed not so much by ideologies as by personalities.

It was not until after my arrest a year later, when I went over in my mind again and again the various conversations I had had with Roth, that I began to question the seeming coincidence of my meeting with Jaffe. I asked myself why Roth, who had been so interested in bringing us together for the exchange of information, never once inquired afterwards about my relations with Jaffe.

It now occurred to me that Roth's avoidance of the subject was not quite normal. And ever since I have been pestered by the thought: "Had not that casual meeting with Jaffe, which brought so much distress to me, been carefully pre-arranged?"

After meeting Jaffe, I naturally began to follow *Amerasia* with increased interest. Often I was surprised to discover how closely the situation in Asia as presented in Jaffe's magazine corresponded to that given by our naval and military attachés and by the State Department's field representatives in China.

In June 1944 *Amerasia* came out with a sharp attack on Undersecretary Grew, who was opposed to the proposed bombing of Emperor Hirohito's palace and who was reputed to favor the retention of the monarchy after the defeat of Japan as a stabilizing element in the Far East. This view of Mr. Grew's, which General MacArthur later put into effect, was a challenge to the pro-Soviet group in the China Section, whose objective was internal revolution in Japan.

Never having been identified with any Communist organization or "front," I did not suspect anything untoward in the attack upon Mr. Grew. I did notice, however, that Roth had taken a deep interest in Jaffe's criticism of the Undersecretary. Roth told me that he was working on a book in which he would arraign Grew's policies.

I ascribe the anti-Grew campaign to the differences between the Grew school in the State Department which favored a stable Japan as the keystone of American postwar policy in the Pacific and the school which favored a strong China as our best security in Asia.

When Jaffe came to Washington on his next trip, he invited me and my wife to dinner at a Chinese restaurant. In the course of our conversation he told me that he was worried by a report that Undersecretary Grew had been angered by the attack in *Amerasia*. It was obvious that the report had come to him from an inside source in the State Department.

At the same time Vice President Henry A. Wallace was dispatched on a mission to China, the main purpose of which was to induce Chiang Kai-shek to form a united front with the Communist insurgents. The mission followed upon the outbreak of the so-called Kazak incident in the early part of 1944 in which Soviet Russia was involved.

The American public was not allowed to know the facts reported by American observers in China, namely, that Moscow had come to the aid of the Chinese Communists in the remote Sinkiang province by engineering an uprising there. This was two years before the Iran Incident. It was done to divert Nationalist troops from the Communist areas. Five full divisions were sent by Chiang Kai-shek into Sinkiang, thus weakening the front against the Japanese and opening the gates of the northwestern Shensi and Kansu provinces to the Communists.

Even before Wallace returned from the Far East, Moscow which was not at war with Japan, launched a propaganda drive against the recognized government of China. On July 18, the mouthpiece of the Kremlin, *War and the Working Class*, published a warning to Chungking to end its conflict with the Communist forces.

This was the opening gun in a smear campaign which soon was reflected in the so-called liberal press in the United States. Our veteran ally Chiang Kai-shek was denounced as a Fascist. Correspondents and commentators who had never raised their voices against the dictatorship in Russia now echoed the Soviet-inspired vituperation of the Kuomintang regime as a dangerous dictatorship.

The question as to whether Soviet Russia would enter the war against Japan was uppermost in Allied councils in those days. China's foreign minister, T. V. Soong, told our Ambassador Gauss that he was convinced that Russia would attack Japan when Germany was defeated, but would do so for the sole purpose of sovietizing the Far East. Soong warned that America's headaches would commence only then. It was a warning which Washington completely disregarded.

\* \* \*

On September 1, 1944, I was transferred from the Naval Intelligence to the State Department, where I was attached to the planning and research unit entrusted with the drafting of basic post-war policy toward China, Japan, Korea, Siam, and other Far Eastern zones. I discovered to my amazement that the State Department had no clear-cut general policy, but was run by cliques which pursued their own preconceived aims and were often in violent conflict.

The pro-Soviet group in the China Section, whose views were reflected by *Amerasia*, and whose members were in touch with Jaffe and Roth, formed a particularly compact clique. Secretary Ludden of the American Embassy in

Chungking was a leading figure in the group. So was John Davies, a native of Chengtu, who acted as State Department attaché with our military observers in China.

He seemed to believe and report almost anything in the way of information against the Kuomintang and Chiang Kai-shek, swallowing whole and relaying nearly everything that the Communists gave him. Mr. Davies held the view that the Chinese Communists were a breed apart from the Soviet elements and had no intention of aligning themselves with Soviet Russia.

John Stewart Service, a junior colleague and friend of Mr. Davies, who was stationed as a field representative in China and acted as political adviser to General Stilwell, tried hard to convince Washington that the rebel Communists were pursuing a policy of avoiding civil war. I remember that Ambassador Gauss did not quite subscribe to this theory. I also recall that in an attempt to discredit Ambassador Gauss's analysis of the Communist-Kuomintang conflict, Mr. John Carter Vincent, chief of the China Section, suggested that it was the failure of the Kuomintang to back the reforms championed by the Communists that was largely responsible for the difficulties in China.

Playing the part of a lone wolf, although one hundred percent in accord with the pro-Soviet China Group, was John W. Emmerson, who served as political adviser to Admiral Chester Nimitz in both Chinese and Japanese affairs.

I remember how our Consul in Kweilin had interviewed General Li Chi-shen on the subject of the Democratic League which was represented in official dispatches as a liberal organization, and how he waxed hot in his report in an effort to impress Washington with all the abuses heaped by General Li upon the Chungking government. It appeared strange to me that a United States official should have been so receptive to violent criticism of the government to which he was accredited. At no time did any of these field representatives report upon the Communists who had helped create the Democratic League and who manipulated it as a leftist "front."

The encouragement extended to the Chinese Communists by many of our officials there and by some of the writers whom they were inspiring was such that the Reds in China declared they would sit back and wait for stronger United States pressure upon Chiang Kai-shek. This pressure did not fail to be forthcoming.

In the early fall of 1944 Donald M. Nelson and General Patrick Hurley were dispatched to China as the President's special envoys to inform Chiang Kai-shek of American disappointment over his failure to form a united front with the Communists. The two envoys requested the Generalissimo to reorganize his Cabinet and to place an American general in command of the Chinese armies. It was understood that General Stilwell would be the American commander.

Chiang Kai-shek was at first inclined to make some compromise for the sake of Allied unity but not at the expense of Chinese sovereignty. President Roosevelt exerted his own direct pressure on the Generalissimo to back up his envoy's demands.

Then came the Stilwell incident. John S. Service, Stilwell's political adviser, accompanied a highly secret military mission to Communist headquarters at Yenan. Upon the return of this mission, old "Vinegar" Joe demanded that Chiang Kai-shek permit him to equip and arm some 300,000 Chinese Communists and put them in the field alongside the Nationalist armies against the Japanese. Chiang Kai-shek saw in this American proposal a Soviet plot to build up the very rebel forces which had been waging civil war against his government. He requested the recall of General Stilwell.

The day before President Roosevelt announced that Stilwell had been relieved of his command, on October 30, 1944, John S. Service submitted his report No. 40 to the State Department. As disclosed months later by General Hurley in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that report was "a general statement of how to let fall the government I was sent over there to sustain. The report was circulated among the Communists I was trying to harmonize with the Chiang Kai-shek government."

During these and the ensuing months Philip Jaffe and Kate Mitchell made numerous trips from New York to Washington. Mr. Jaffe would call me and collect whatever biographical data on Chinese personalities I had, but I found it increasingly strange that he would not reciprocate with the promised biographical information on the Communist figures that I needed.

\* \* \*

The Espionage Case itself had its origin with the appearance in the December 1944 issue of *Amerasia* of an article containing unadulterated passages from

an extremely confidential report to the Office of Strategic Services. Two employees of the OSS were struck by the passages which they had read in the original and became curious as to how the information turned up in the columns of *Amerasia*. A preliminary investigation conducted by OSS disclosed that various other secret documents were in possession of Jaffe, Kate Mitchell, and Mark Gayn, all of *Amerasia*.

The FBI then took charge of the affair. As established by Congressman Dondero, the government agents spent several months on the case. In the course of their quest, it was found that John S. Service was in communication from China with Mr. Jaffe. The substance of some of Service's confidential messages to the State Department reached the offices of *Amerasia* in New York before they arrived in Washington. Among the papers found in possession of Mr. Jaffe was Document No. 58, one of Mr. Service's secret reports, entitled "Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek—Decline of his Prestige and Criticism of and Opposition to his Leadership."

In the course of the FBI investigation *Amerasia* was revealed as the center of a constellation of Communist zealots and their satellite fellow-travellers. The ramifications of *Amerasia* reached far beyond those of a modest academic publication. It appeared, for instance, that Owen Lattimore, consultant to OWI and to the State Department on Far Eastern affairs, was formerly an editor of *Amerasia*. Another former editor was Frederick Vanderbilt Field, a columnist for *The Daily Worker* and secretary of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, with which Kate Mitchell had been affiliated in various capacities since 1933.

The publisher of *Amerasia* was a prosperous manufacturer of greeting cards who had a rather unusual record for a well-to-do businessman. Mr. Philip Jacob Jaffe, naturalized in 1923, had served as contributing editor of *Labor Defender*, monthly magazine of the International Labor Defense, a Communist organization, in 1933. From 1934 to 1936 he had been a member of the editorial board of *China Today*, publication of the pro-Soviet American Friends of the Chinese people, under his admitted alias of J. W. Phillips. Under that name he presided in 1935 over a banquet at which Earl Browder was a speaker. He had lectured at the Jefferson School of Social Science, an avowed Communist Party institution. In addition to several other pro-Soviet organizations, he was a member of the Board of Directors of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. *The New York Times* described him on June 7, 1945 (subsequent to his arrest) as "an active supporter of pro-Communist and pro-Soviet movements for a number of years."

What *The New York Times* did not know and what I could not possibly know, but what was established during the investigation, according to the information gathered by Congressman Dondero, was the following: that Jaffe is known to have visited Earl Browder's apartment several times in the spring of 1945; that he dined on more than one occasion at the Soviet consulate in New York; that when the Chinese Communist delegate, Tung Pi-Wu, while in the United States in April 1945 to attend the San Francisco Conference, visited New York, he met Earl Browder one day in Jaffe's apartment; that Jaffe had been a liberal contributor to pro-Soviet causes and funds; and that at one time Jaffe had in his possession a message sent by Ambassador Hurley to his wife, advising her not to rent their home in Chesapeake Bay for the summer, inasmuch as he expected to return to the United States before the end of the summer.

How this strictly personal message fell into Jaffe's hands was never ascertained. But Congressional sources did establish the remarkable fact that Mr. Jaffe once reserved two tables at a hotel banquet held to launch a pro-Communist China front in the name of "The fifth floor, 35 East 12th Street," the national headquarters of the American Communist Party.

Kate L. Mitchell, co-editor of *Amerasia*, was a Buffalo heiress whose income from a trust fund has been estimated to run as high as \$15,000 a year. Born in 1908, a graduate of Bryn Mawr, widely traveled and a student of Asiatic problems, Miss Mitchell was so close to Jaffe that she had in her possession keys to all the files in the office of *Amerasia*. When John Stewart Service returned from China, Miss Mitchell gave a party at which he was present. He had previously attended a special press conference held by the Institute of Pacific Relations in which he supported the position of the Chinese Communists.

Lieutenant Andrew Roth, a rising *Amerasia* star and protégé of Jaffe's is a native New Yorker who had attended City College. Mr. Dondero disclosed that Roth had been placed in his key post of liaison officer between Naval Intelligence and the State Department "despite a totally unfavorable report result-

ing from an investigation by the Office of Naval Intelligence itself when he first applied for his commission."

Mark J. Gayn, a native of Manchuria, whose articles in leading magazines were based upon confidential documents supplied by Jaffe, was frequently consulted by the latter after his Washington trips, particularly in Japanese affairs. On at least one occasion John S. Service was known to have visited Gayn in his apartment. I have never met Gayn and was barely acquainted with Service.

\* \* \*

Of many of these vital facts I was ignorant before my arrest. The political background of Jaffe and Miss Mitchell and their confreres was completely foreign to me. I knew Jaffe and his group as the editor of a magazine which had almost semi-official standing among the left-wingers in the State Department. In spite of the fact that I was gathering biographical material on Chinese leaders for Mr. Jaffe, I did not do along with the *Amerasia* circle in questions of our policy in the Far East.

In the spring of 1945, when it was generally believed that our next step in the war would be an invasion of China, the problem of Manchuria came up for discussion and analysis in the State Department. In the event of our seizure of Manchuria, were we to hand it over eventually to any local Chinese faction, even the Communists? Mr. Robert Feary, a well-meaning former official of our Embassy in Japan, who drew his knowledge of China largely from the field dispatches of the pro-Soviet school, proposed that we turn over Manchuria to the Chinese Communists if Chiang Kai-shek's troops were not there to take it over immediately.

This proposal struck me as outrageous, since President Roosevelt had promised Chiang Kai-shek at the Cairo Conference that Manchuria would revert to his nation, by which we unmistakably meant the properly constituted government of China. I launched the initial protest against this and was able to bring about the defeat of the plan.

Shortly after this meeting on Manchurian policy, I was warned by a young foreign service officer of Scandinavian extraction in a friendly way that I would soon get into trouble if I opposed the anti-Kuomintang group in the China Section. Soon afterwards I ran into Lieutenant Roth in the street, and he told me that John Carter Vincent, head of the China Section, suspected me of being "too close to the Chiang Kai-shek crowd." I resented the remark, since I had but purely social relations with the Chinese Embassy in Washington. I wondered afterwards whether Roth had used a fabricated story merely to test me.

Late in May, I was surprised to find Andrew Roth in my apartment when I returned home from the office. He was in an extremely nervous state. He told me that he and his wife had intended to drop in upon us that evening, that she had gone shopping, and that in the meanwhile he had received some upsetting news which he was anxious to convey to her. It appeared that he had been ordered to go to Honolulu and that he was making preparations to leave when suddenly his orders were canceled. He evinced so much uneasiness and seemed so reluctant to talk about the matter that I was somewhat baffled.

When his charming wife Renee arrived about an hour or so later, happy and smiling, she was dumbfounded and put out by the bad news. I tried to comfort her by saying that the Navy probably would have a better job for her husband, but she brushed my remark aside in a peeved manner that indicated anxiety and fear.

Is it possible that both Roth and his wife were already aware then that they were being shadowed and investigated, but said nothing about it to me? I myself felt perfectly at ease, for I had not the faintest notion that I was standing on the brink of disaster.

\* \* \*

It was just about this time that Mark Gayn, who had made his plans the previous year, prepared to go abroad as a foreign correspondent for the *Chicago Sun*. He suddenly called upon George Taylor, in charge of the Far Eastern Section at the OWI in Washington, and asked him to authorize the decontrol of some confidential government documents which Gayn claimed to have used for current articles.

Mr. Taylor issued a letter decontrolling certain papers. This letter Mr. Gayn presented at the New York office of the OWI, and is alleged to have persuaded the person in charge of the files there to interpret Mr. Taylor's authorization so broadly as to cover all the documents Gayn had in his possession.

My arrest in the evening of June 6 came to me like a bolt from the blue. The FBI agents found in my apartment three to four thousand cards of my collection

of data on Chinese personalities, and half a dozen folders of reports and memoranda dealing with political and geographic problems in Asia. Some of these were confidential papers I had taken home to study. None of the documents was of a military character which would affect national security. It was a common practice in Washington among overworked government employees to take home confidential papers to work on.

When word of our arrests had spread through Washington, there was general burning of official papers, taken home innocently or otherwise, all over the Capital.

The strange course which the Espionage Case took from the moment of our arrests became evident to me that night, even when I was led into the office of the United States Commissioner for arraignment. On June 6 Andrew Roth was still a uniformed lieutenant in the service of the United States Navy. That night, as I beheld him a fellow-prisoner, I was surprised to find him wearing civilian clothes. Upon inquiry I learned that literally overnight Lieutenant Roth had been mustered out of the service. It was not until later that it had dawned on me how grave it might have been for Roth to face charges under the Espionage Act in wartime while still an officer in the Naval Intelligence.

When Kate Mitchell was arrested in New York that night she had in her possession, according to Congressman Dondero, a highly confidential military document entitled "Plan of Battle Operations for Soldiers." It was a paper of such importance that army officers were subject to courtmartial if they lost their copies. Also in the possession of Miss Mitchell were found documents from the OSS and the Office of Naval Intelligence. These were part of the huge files of top secret material gathered by Jaffe.

Mark Gayn, who had made use at various time of *Amerasia* files, had more than 200 secret documents in his apartment at the time of his arrest. Mr. Gayn was the only one of the *Amerasia* group to admit on the night of his arrest in a signed statement that he had been found in possession of confidential government papers.

Mr. Jaffe, either before the arrest or upon his release on bail, is known to have used the authorization to decontrol certain papers issued to Gayn by the OWI in some inexplicable manner so as to claim exemption for all the documents found in his own possession.

\* \* \*

On June 8, the day after the arrests, Mr. Joseph C. Grew, then Acting Secretary of State, announced to the country that "a comprehensive security program is to be continued unrelentingly in order to stop completely the illegal and disloyal conveyance of confidential and other secret information to unauthorized persons."

Phillip Jaffe, speaking for himself and Miss Mitchell the following day, upon their release on bail, countered with a statement to the press: "The Red-baiting character of this case is scandalous and often libelous."

Mark Gayn raised the cry of the freedom of the press, which certain so-called liberal publications took up so as to eclipse in the public mind the charges under the Espionage Act. Popular radio commentators echoed the cry.

Undersecretary Grew became a target for a campaign of vilification as chief culprit in the case. The former Lieutenant Andrew Roth wrote a series of article in a New York evening paper and published a book in which he attacked Grew as the father of a dangerous State Department policy in the Far East and as the main prop of the throne in Japan which was represented as being in the way of a "democratic" transformation in that country.

While public attention was largely focused upon extraneous issues, the Espionage Case itself was following a special course behind the scenes. It appeared that Kate Mitchell had an influential uncle in Buffalo, a reputable attorney by the name of James M. Mitchell, former President of the New York State Bar Association. Mr. Mitchell was a member of a very influential law firm in Buffalo, Kenefick, Cooke, Mitchell, Bass & Letchworth. The New York City correspondents of that law firm included the most redoubtable Colonel Joseph M. Hartfield, extremely well-known and extremely influential in government circles in Washington. Colonel Hartfield, who is regarded by some as one of the most powerful political lawyers in the country, made at least four trips to Washington where he called on top officials of the Department of Justice in the matter.

At the same time Congressman Emanuel Celler, of New York, interested himself in the defense of the New York figures involved in the case. To what extent he exerted his influence has never been determined. It was perhaps only a coincidence that his law partner, Mr. Arthur Sheinberg, appeared as Jaffe's New York attorney when his case was called before the Criminal Division No. 1 of the District Court of the District of Columbia.



My own attorney was Arthur J. Hilland, whose first demand on me was that I tell him the truth and nothing but the truth. As I had nothing to conceal, my principal worry was my wife's difficulty in raising the \$10,000 bail, for we were people of most modest means.

The grand jury heard first the testimony of Service, Gayn, and Miss Mitchell. At the end of June it was announced that new evidence would be presented by the Justice Department and additional persons would be charged with espionage.

The grand jury proceedings are, of course, secret. But it has been reported to me that John Service had accused me of furnishing Jaffe with documents found in his possession, which was a complete and vicious fabrication. According to Congressman Dondero, for some unaccountable reasons the government attorneys presented to the grand jury only a part of the evidence in their possession.

On August 10 came the sensational announcement that the grand jury had dropped the indictments against Service, Gayn, and Miss Mitchell. The clearing of these three was the signal for a renewed campaign against Under Secretary Grew in the press. Within the State Department, it was generally known, Dean Acheson headed the anti-Grew faction.

The evening of August 13, J. Raymond Walsh, research director of CIO-PAC, outspoken Soviet partisan, made over the radio a strong plea for the defendants in the Espionage Case. Of John Service he said: "His arrest brought some exceedingly powerful people within the government to his defense. Again one can easily infer that those who began this affair wished they hadn't. \* \* \*

A substantial fund for the defense of Mr. Service had been raised with the help of Mortimer Graves, Secretary of The American Council of Learned Societies. No one of the pro-Soviet group bothered about my defense.

On August 14, Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson tendered his resignation to Secretary Byrnes. For a moment it looked as if Mr. Grew had won out. But that same day, August 14, the newly installed Secretary Byrnes addressed a letter to John Service, congratulating him on the "happy termination" of his ordeal and reinstating him to active duty "for important work in connection with Far Eastern affairs." At the same time, Under Secretary Grew wrote to Service a more formal letter expressing his pleasure at being returned to duty and praising his enviable record.

\* \* \*

It was about this time that Joseph E. Davies, of Mission to Moscow fame, was alleged to have declared that Acheson made Grew's resignation from the service a condition of his returning to the State Department.

Two days later Under Secretary Grew, after a lifetime in the diplomatic service, resigned and President Truman announced that Dean Acheson would take over the post of Under Secretary of State.

On September 29 the news that Jaffe had changed his plea from "not guilty" to that of "guilty" of the unauthorized possession of Government documents and was fined \$2,500 hit me like a bombshell. It appeared that by some strange coincidence Jaffe's case had been called before Justice Proctor of the District Court on a Saturday morning. Robert Hitchcock, of Buffalo, had presented the case for the Department of Justice. The court asked for a brief statement of the Government's case, which Mr. Hitchcock promised to do in "less than five minutes."

The FBI has the authority to make arrests only upon the presentation of adequate evidence, but it has nothing to do with the court's disposal of such evidence.

"I have heretofore charged and reiterate now," declared Congressman Dondero on the floor of the House, "that the Court before whom these cases were brought was not fully informed of the facts. A summary of the court proceedings had been furnished to me, which shows no evidence or exhibit obtained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation presented to the court. Jaffe's counsel told the court that Jaffe had no intention of harming the government, and United States Attorney Hitchcock told the court there was no element of disloyalty in connection with the case."

My own situation was growing more deplorable and my financial circumstances more straitened. I had been put "on leave-without-pay" status pending the outcome of the case. I had no means to cover the expenses of my defense. For weeks I had lain awake nights hoping for a speedy trial, expecting an acquittal.

I now resolved to go to New York to look up Mr. Jaffe. I telephoned the office of *Amerasia* and he somewhat reluctantly agreed to see me. I told him of my financial plight and he agreed to defray the costs of my defense as well as to pay

## "ARGUMENT FALLACIOUS AND \* \* \* POORLY CHOSEN"

"That argument is entirely fallacious and, I think, poorly chosen by the Assistant Attorney General," said Mr. Bielaski.

"OSS was created by executive order and authorized to provide its own security. It was an espionage and counter-espionage agency. Our search, without a warrant, was entirely reasonable in time of war. We were trying to recover OSS property.

"If we had tried to get a search warrant, it would have ruined the whole affair."

The FBI, he pointed out, had "13 volumes of exhibits" to bolster the Amerasia prosecution.

## "3,000 DOCUMENTS INVOLVED IN CASE"

"We calculated that a total of 3,000 documents were involved in the Amerasia case in a three-months period," Mr. Bielaski said. "In that time every State Department document concerning the Far East passed thru the magazine."

Because of its secrecy requirements, he declined to reveal what he testified at the Tydings subcommittee closed session. Asked if his former boss, William J. Donovan, OSS chief, would be willing to testify if called, Mr. Bielaski replied:

"General Donovan is very willing and, I think, somewhat anxious to testify as to the seriousness of the documents."

So far as it is known, neither General Donovan nor any other witness has been called by the Senate subcommittee.

Meanwhile, the Amerasia case has become one of the most-talked-of issues on Capitol Hill and in official Washington.

Among both Republicans and Democrats in Congress the feeling is widespread that this is the time, for once and always, to clear up the Amerasia mystery.

They are depending on the assurance of a thoro inquiry made by Senator Milhard E. Tydings (Democrat, Maryland), chairman of the subcommittee.

## LOYALTY FILE INSPECTION HAS TOP PRIORITY

Up to now, tho, the Amerasia case has been allowed to bog down in the subcommittee's overall job of investigating charges of disloyalty in the State Department.

The legal staff has given top priority to the examination of the 81 State Department loyalty files. Until that's completed the Amerasia case will get little attention.

The loyalty file inspection itself is in danger of bogging down. Because of Sen. Tydings' restrictions, the Republican minority has concluded that the entire inspection procedure is farcical. They may walk out on it any time.

So the immediate prospects of an Amerasia inquiry by the Tydings group are not too bright.

## EXHIBIT No. 22

See transcript of proceedings for afternoon of June 2, commencing at page 87.

## EXHIBIT No. 23

[Doc. 100-3]

EXCERPT FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE, MAY 22, 1950

(Pages 7543-44)

Mr. Brooks. That office at 225 Fifth Avenue. It was under surveillance for a week or 10 days. The office, was operating every night until late at night. There were lights in there. We could not get in to take a look at it for that reason. Then we made plans to enter the place under a subterfuge, not by force.

When the time came, we were let in, but we did deceive the people in the buildings as to who we were, and what our purpose was. We entered the building Sunday night, March 11, at about close to midnight. We were let into the office.

Mr. CHIEF. Of what year?

the fine which might be imposed upon me. At this time, in October, the only two of the Case of Six left on the calendar, were those of myself and of Andrew Roth.

To run ahead of the story, my own case came up on November 2. Upon insistent advice, I decided not to contest it as I had planned, and pleaded *nolo contendere*. The court imposed a fine of five hundred dollars, which was paid by Mr. Jaffe's representative. He also paid all other expenses in my case, which ran to an additional three thousand dollars. As for Andrew Roth, the indictment against him was dismissed in February 1946 for insufficient evidence.

During my conference with Mr. Jaffe in October, he dropped a remark which one could never forget.

"Well, we've suffered a lot," he said, "but, anyhow, we got Grew out."

Ambassador Hurley was next to go. The road was clear for the pro-Soviet China bloc to take over the Far Eastern Division of the State Department. The policy which General Stilwell attempted to force down the throat of our ally Chiang Kai-shek as a means of defeating Japan was entrusted to General Marshall after Japan's defeat by America and after the rape of Manchuria by Soviet forces.—EDITOR'S NOTE.

#### EXHIBIT No. 21

[From the Washington Daily News, Monday, May 22, 1950]

#### TYDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE ON AMERASIA CASE—AMERASIA PROBE PROSPECTS DIM— ONLY TWO WITNESSES HEARD IN MONTH

(By Frederick Woltman, Scripps-Howard staff writer)

The Tydings Senate subcommittee, which on April 17 promised a new investigation of the Amerasia case, more than one month later has done virtually nothing about it.

Only two witnesses have been questioned, both in closed session. And the subcommittee's legal staff has not yet got around to looking at the 1700 exhibits which lay the groundwork of the case of the stolen Government documents.

One of the two witnesses was the spokesman for the Justice Department, which is under fire for the way it handled the case. He is James M. McInerney, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the criminal division.

#### BELITTLED BY SPOKESMAN FOR JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

The effect of his testimony, it was learned, was to belittle the Amerasia incident and play down the need for a thorough investigation.

Mr. McInerney told the senators May 4 there was little of importance in the 1700 records recovered by the FBI on June 6, 1945.

Contrary to the stand taken by the FBI and State Department at that time, the Justice Department dismissed the contents of the stolen documents as mostly "teacup gossip."

The other witness was Frank Bielaski, chief investigator of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), who made the first wartime raid on Amerasia and discovered a treasure trove of stolen State Department records. His testimony has never been made public.

But yesterday, over NBC Television's "Meet the Press," Mr. Bielaski declared that the Hiss-Chambers case was "chicken feed" compared with the Amerasia.

#### FEELS THERE WAS "EFFORT TO WHITEWASH"

He said he felt "very definitely" there was "a concerted effort on the part of someone to whitewash the Amerasia case."

"I do not think the case was ever properly or thoroughly investigated," added Mr. Bielaski.

Many important witnesses have never been called, he said, listing the names of six, all ex-FBI agents. He himself was never interviewed by the Department of Justice until last week, the former OSS official stated.

In the interview, Mr. Bielaski struck back at the Tydings subcommittee's only other witness, Assistant Attorney General McInerney.

Mr. McInerney, he was told, testified that the Justice Department was handicapped because evidence had been "burglarized" and "obtained by theft from the Amerasia office by OSS."

Mr. Brooks. Nineteen hundred and forty-five. We were let into the office of Amerasia magazine. I went myself because I did not believe in sending somebody else to do something that I would not do. We had a party of five. I personally, when we entered the office, devoted my time to looking through the office, the front office, hoping to find this dummy I have described.

I did not find it. About all I found was a lot of information on circulation. I looked over this information with some degree of care because I wanted to know about how big an operation the Amerasia magazine was.

I found, at best, their circulation had been some 2,500 copies, and it had steadily decreased. It was about 1,700. Dealer distribution had dropped from 500 to 300. It was losing money, I could tell from correspondence, and looking at the accounts.

It was perfectly obvious it was not a paying venture.

About the time I had come to the conclusion there was nothing in the front office of interest to me—while I was in the front office, I had sent some of my agents back through the rear part of the office. It is quite a nice office, and very well furnished. One of them came and said, "We think you better come back here. We found some stuff you ought to see."

I started back. Before I went back to the rooms where they were, I observed on the right side of the main corridor there was a room; to be conservative, I would say it is half as big as this. It was devoted, exclusively, to photo copy work. They had a photo copy machine, and developer pans all around on the shelves. The place was equipped to make photo copies, and make them in large quantities.

I did not know what function that was for for a little magazine like Amerasia. There it was, and I looked it over.

I went to the end of the corridor. On the end over to the left was the room of the associate editor who was Kate Mitchell.

On the right was a smaller office of Philip Jaffe, who was the editor. Just before you came to those offices, on the right, was a large library twice as big as this with volumes all over the place dealing, principally, with the Far East, and many of them were works on communism and Communist movements, etc.

It was a library of several thousand volumes. I went into the office of Jaffe. He had a desk about like this.

It was covered with originals and freshly made photo copies of documents, every one of which was secret in its character. Some of them were directed, personally, to the Secretary of State. Some of them were from military attachés in China and other places, confidential. All of them were marked "Not to be shown OWI." That was evidence of the confidential nature.

Some were from Naval Intelligence. There were a good many on his desk. It would seem from the freshness of the copies that those photo copies had just been made. They accounted for the fact that the office was working so late at night.

Mr. HANCOCK. To whom were they addressed?

Mr. BROOKS. The State Department documents were addressed to the Secretary for his personal attention.

Mr. SPRINGER. Were they all photostatic copies, or were there any originals?

Mr. BROOKS. The originals were in there, and the photostatic copies. Everybody was astounded at this stuff.

While we were looking it over, a man happened to look behind a door. Behind the door he found a suitcase and two briefcases. The suitcase was a bellows-type suitcase that was probably that thick [indicating].

Mr. HANCOCK. Two feet?

Mr. BROOKS. About 18 inches. The briefcases were very heavy with documents. I had along an expert who opened all sorts of locks. He had opened all the locks. He opened the suitcase, the briefcases. When he opened the suitcase, it seemed to be a specially constructed affair with about 10 to 15 pockets in it. It was a bellows-type suitcase spread out in this way. It was literally loaded with secret documents of all sorts from all departments of the Government.

Mr. HANCOCK. Originals?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. These were all originals. There were no copies in the suitcase. There was one exception; in that suitcase I found an original, a typewritten original, and four copies of the particular document that I was after, that was the Office of Strategic Service document on Siam.

In addition to that, I think there were five more secret documents on the Office of Strategic Service which we had not missed, one of which was "top secret," and extremely valuable and confidential.

I took this stuff out and spread it around. It covered almost every department in the Government with the exception of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. There were no documents from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. There were documents from the British Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, G-2, State Department, Office of Censorship, Office of Strategic Service, and probably others. There were so many of them, at that moment, I started to have a list made. There were so many we could not list them. These documents had from 3 to 4 to 150 pages. There were 300 documents.

Mr. CHELF. Either confidential, secret, or top secret?

Mr. BROOKS. Everyone of them bore the stamp that the possession of these documents is a violation of the Espionage Act. It was stamped all over them.

About that time, one of my men who had gone into the library came in and said he found something in the library.

He had an envelope which was not sealed. It was a large manila envelope. In that envelope were, I should say, 15 or 20 documents. I could not tell whether they came mimeographed or whether they were photo copied on this machine. They were a little blurred. They were not photostats. They must have been photo copies. In between these documents, every other one, we found six top-secret documents of the Navy Department. I looked at these myself. I do not recall all six of them. I am sorry I did not make more notes about them, but I remember distinctly two, probably the first two that I read. One of them was entitled, and I do not know the exact words, but one was entitled, "The bombing program for Japan." It was top secret. I read it. It showed how Japan was to be bombed progressively in the industrial centers, and it named the cities.

The second one that I read gave the location of all the ships of the Japanese fleet, subsequent to the battle of Leyte; I guess it was October 1944. It gave the ships by name and where they were hiding.

I might say, off the record, at that time I did not know anything about the atomic bomb. I had never heard of it. I have since been very curious trying to wrack my memory whether there was anything in those other four top secret documents. It would not have meant anything to me if it had. I had never heard of the atomic bomb. I do not remember the other information. We did not take the documents. We put them back where we got them.

We went back out into the other room. We look over this stuff. I came to the conclusion, if I came down here to the Office of Strategic Service and told them what I had seen, they just would not believe me. I, therefore, determined to take 12 to 14 of the documents and bring them down and show them to them as proof.

I picked out all of the Office of Strategic Service documents, including the five copies of the one that I was after, and either seven or eight additional documents. I picked documents that had marks of some sort on them to indicate through whose hands they had gone.

I put those in my pocket. I felt sure that there were so many there that they could not possibly miss those documents for a week, anyhow. I put those in my pocket. We left that place. We put everything back the way we found it. We left there about 2:30 in the morning.

I took a plane and came to Washington. I had a meeting the first thing Monday morning with the security officer. I did not, myself, make a list of those 12 or 14 documents. He did. He prepared a memorandum which is at the present time on file with the Office of Strategic Services describing those documents and the nature of them, what is in them.

There is a memo showing exactly what I brought down here as evidence for my own office.

They were so startling that we lost sight of the first document we were searching for. The others were so much more important.

Doc. 100-3

Before I could even deliver all of them, which I did one at a time because it gave me a little pleasure to do it, they had gotten in touch with General Donovan. They had the chief of the secretariat down in the office when I delivered all these papers to them, Donovan and I think the security officer. Mr. Van Beuren went immediately over to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to show them this stuff.

If not then, then that night or the following morning, Mr. Van Beuren, the security officer, went to a meeting where this stuff was shown to the Secretary of State.

I am telling you that because that was the disposition made, and because Mr. Van Beuren, to whom I was adviser at the time, was perfectly willing to come here and tell you what he knows about it and the character of the documents, and what he did with them, and what they decided to do about the case.

I made only one stipulation when I turned the stuff over to them, that was that I and my men were so apprehensive about this whole thing, that somebody must do something about it. We did not want to sit by and see this thing go on. We wanted action. We wanted it in a hurry. We thought something should be done within a week. They promised action would be taken within a week. It was only 6 days later that the Federal Bureau of Investigation moved in in New York.

Mr. Gurnea, who was an inspector for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, was sent up to take charge. He organized the various groups. He placed various persons in the Amerasia magazine, offices and staff under surveillance. They tapped the telephones. They entered the premises. I am sure they photostated all of the documents that we saw there less only those which I delivered down here to my home office.

Mr. Brooks. We felt the men who were in this place, that we had cut off or found a principal channel of information from the Government files down here into some hands which we suspected were Communist hands. We never knew where this stuff went after it got out of there. I think it was when the Peace Conference was on in San Francisco that I entered a complaint with the Office of Strategic Services. It seemed to me a terrible thing that certain persons out there attending the conference had secret information from our State Department and were informed on what our State Department planned to do and what the State Department thought about. Nothing was done about that.

It was shortly after that that they did shut down on these people and arrested six of them. I knew, also, that during this period, a second lot of stuff was brought out from Washington; that Jaffe came down, or someone came down. My impression was that it was Jaffe. They got another suitcase full of it and brought it back. The Federal Bureau of Investigation also photographed all of that. In their exhibit, they must have all of the first lot and all of the second lot. We were told the second lot was just as important as the first lot.

#### EXHIBIT No. 24

[From the New York Times, Tuesday, October 31, 1944]

**ALLIES HEED 40,000 NAZIS TOWARD MEUSE; 3 JAPANESE CRUISERS BOMBED AT MANILA; STILWELL RECALL BARES RIFT WITH CHIANG—LONG SCHISM SEEN—STILWELL BREAK STEMS FROM CHIANG REFUSAL TO PRESS WAR FULLY—PEACE WITH REDS BARRED—GENERALISSIMO REGARDS THEIR ARMIES FIGHTING JAPANESE AS THREAT TO HIS RULE**

The following account of the recall of Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell is by the Chungking correspondent of the New York Times, who has just returned to this country. It was delayed and finally cleared by the War Department censorship in Washington.

(By Brooks Atkinson)

Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, relieved of his command in China, Burma and India, before leaving Chungking on Oct. 21 made a final swift tour of some of the military bases in his command and then flew directly toward Washington in his silver-colored transport plane facetiously dubbed "Uncle Joe's Chariot."

For the last two months negotiations had been going on between President Roosevelt's personal representative, Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to give General Stilwell full command of the Chinese ground and air forces under the Generalissimo and to increase China's participation in the counter-offensive against Japan.

Although the Generalissimo at first was inclined to agree to General Stilwell's appointment as commander, he decided later that he would accept any American commander except General Stilwell.

## PRESSED FOR REFORM

His attitude toward the American negotiations became stiff and hostile. At a private meeting of the standing committee of the Kuomintang (National party) Central Executive Committee this month he announced the terms of his personal ultimatum to Americans who were pressing him for military and governmental reform.

He declared that General Stilwell must go, that the control of American lend-lease materials must be put in his hands and that he would not be coerced by Americans into helping to unify China by making terms with the Chinese Communists. If America did not yield on these points, he said China would go back to fighting the Japanese alone, as she did before Pearl Harbor.

President Roosevelt agreed to the Generalissimo's demand for General Stilwell's recall. Dividing the huge China-Burma-India war sector in two, the War Department appointed Maj. Gen. Albert G. Wedemeyer, now Deputy Chief of Staff to Admiral Lord Louis Mountbatten, as Commander of United States Army Forces in China and Lieut. Gen. Daniel I. Sultan, General Stilwell's Chief of Staff in India, as Commander of United States Army Forces in India and Burma.

After a career of more than twenty years largely devoted to military affairs in China and two years and eight months as commander of the United States Army Forces in China, Burma, and India and as Allied Chief of Staff to the Generalissimo, "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell has now concluded a busy and constantly frustrated attempt to help China stay in the war and to improve the combat efficiency of the Chinese forces.

Uncle Joe speaks Chinese. He knows more about China than most foreigners. He is more intimately acquainted with the needs and capacities of the Chinese Army than the Generalissimo and Gen. Ho. Ying-chin, Minister of War and Chief of Staff, because he has repeatedly been in the field with the troops.

He is commonly regarded as the ablest field commander in China since "Chinese" Gordon. The second retreat with Stilwell seemed the final one. It was not from the enemy but from an ally.

The decision to relieve General Stilwell has the most profound implications for China as well as American policy toward China and the Allied war effort in the Far East. It may mean that the United States has decided from now on to discount China's part in a counter-offensive.

Inside China it represents the political triumph of a moribund anti-democratic regime that is more concerned with maintaining its political supremacy than in driving the Japanese out of China. America is now committed to at least passively supporting a regime that has become increasingly unpopular and distrusted in China, that maintains three secret police services and concentration camps for political prisoners, that stifles free speech and resists democratic forces.

## THE MAIN DIFFERENCE

The fundamental difference between the Generalissimo and General Stilwell has been that the latter has been eager to fight the Japanese in China without delay and the Generalissimo has hoped that he would not have to.

In no other way is it possible to understand the long series of obstructions and delays that have made it impossible for General Stilwell to fulfill his original mission of equipping and training the "unlimited manpower" resources of the Chinese Army.

The Generalissimo has one positive virtue for which America is now indebted; he has never made peace with the Japanese, although there have been times when his Ministers thought the future looked hopeless. But the technique of preserving his ticklish balance of political power in China keeps him a passive man.

Although he is the acknowledged leader of China, he has no record of personal military achievement and his basic ideas for political leadership are those of a war lord. He conceives of armies as political forces.

In an enormous, loosely strung country populated chiefly by ignorant peasantry he maintains his authority by preventing any group from becoming too powerful. A few well equipped armies under a command not entirely loyal to him personally might upset the military and political balance inside China and curtail his authority.

The Chinese Communists, whom the generalissimo started trying to liquidate in 1927, have good armies that are now fighting guerrilla warfare against the

Japanese in northeast China. The generalissimo regards these armies as the chief threat to his supremacy. For several years he has immobilized 300,000 to 500,000 (no one knows just how many) Central Government troops to blockade the Communists and keep them from expanding.

Distrusting the Communists, the generalissimo has made no sincere attempt to arrange at least a truce with them for the duration of the war. The generalissimo's regime, based on the support and subservience of General Ho, Dr. H. H. Kung, Minister of Finance, and Dr. Chen Li-fu, Minister of Education, has remained fundamentally unchanged over a long period and has become bureaucratic, inefficient, and corrupt.

Most of the armies are poorly fed and shockingly maltreated. In some parts of the country the peasants regard the armies as bandits and thieves. In Henan last Spring the peasants turned against the Chinese armies during the Japanese offensive in revenge for the ruthlessness with which the armies collected rice during the famine years.

Most of China's troubles now are the result of her having been at war with Japan for more than seven years and totally blockaded for two and one-half.

The reason nothing is done to alleviate the miseries is that the generalissimo is determined to maintain his group of aging reactionaries in power until the war is over, when, it is commonly believed, he will resume his war against the Chinese Communists without distraction.

Bewildered and alarmed by the rapidity with which China is now falling apart, he feels secure only with associates who obey him implicitly. His rages become more and more ungovernable and attack the symptoms rather than the causes of China's troubles.

#### ACQUESCENCE IN REGIME

Since the negotiations with General Hurley began the generalissimo's attitude toward America has become more resentful and American criticisms of China is hotly rebuked. Relieving General Stilwell and appointing a successor has the effect of making us acquiesce in an unenlightened, cold-hearted autocratic political régime.

Into this stagnant, baleful atmosphere General Stilwell came in February 1942, animated by the single idea of fighting the Japanese immediately. Like most foreigners who know the Chinese people, he loved them, for they are the glory of China. From long experience Stilwell had great confidence in the capacities of the Chinese soldiers, who even then were fighting on nothing.

In November, 1941, the Magruder Military Mission had already made an agreement with the generalissimo to train and equip the Chinese Army on the theory that it would then become unnecessary to ship thousands of doughboys to fight on Chinese soil. The war in China was initially handicapped by the decision to fight Germany first and Japan second. General Stilwell was never able to get 1 per cent of the American Army for use in his C-B-I theatre and was never able to get all the equipment he has wanted, because it has always been needed elsewhere.

On March 3, 1942, less than a month after he had arrived in China, General Stilwell was plunged into the calamitous Burma campaign without notice. He had to return to Chungking to induce the generalissimo to come to the front to vest him with sufficient authority to command the troops.

Even then the command was never secure or efficient. There were other troubles. At a time when the troops needed transport, most of China's trucks were hauling civilian loot out of Burma up the road into China, where goods were worth huge sums of money.

When at last Stilwell got out of Burma into India he did persuade the generalissimo to let him feed, train and equip the Chinese soldiers who finally arrived. After training of a year and a half, those soldiers were the backbone of the Chinese divisions who got Myitkyina back last August and are now pushing toward Bhamo to free the Burma road. Inside China everything Stilwell has tried to do has been obstructed and delayed.

The generalissimo and his staff like the United States Air Force, which they get free and which asks for nothing except food and airfields, which we equip with buildings and installations. But the Chinese Government hedges and hesitates over anything involving the use of its armies. Foreigners can only conclude that the Chinese Government wants to save its armies to secure its political power after the war.

A nervous and driving field officer whose is impatient with administrative details and political tangles, General Stilwell is no diplomat. He goes straight



to the point in his dealings with anybody. He is plain and salty. He is personally incapable of assuming a reverential mood toward the generalissimo and he is impatient with incompetent meddling in military command. Although General Stilwell is anything but arrogant, the generalissimo complained that the American was trying to subjugate him.

But with the situation in China as it is, no diplomatic genius could have overcome the generalissimo's basic unwillingness to risk his armies in battle with the Japanese. Amid the intrigue and corruption of China's political and military administration, General Stilwell has been a lone man trying to follow orders, improve the combat efficiency of the Chinese Army, force open the Burma Road and get China back into the war.

Now he has been forced out of China by the political system that has been consistently blocking him and America is acquiescing in a system that is undemocratic in spirit as well as fact and is also unrepresentative of the Chinese people, who are good allies.

#### EXHIBIT No. 25

[From the New York Times, Friday, March 23, 1945]

#### CHINESE REDS SEEN HOPEFUL OF UNITY—U. S. POLITICAL AIDE BACK FROM AREA DECLARES COMMUNISTS HAVE POPULAR SUPPORT

WASHINGTON, March 22.—Raymond P. Ludden, foreign service officer attached to Lieut. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer's staff as political adviser, returning from an eight-month stay in the Communist territory in China, reported today that these Communists are fighting the Japanese, that they have popular support in their area, and that the people of the region all hope to obtain national unity in China.

Mr. Ludden was one of two State Department officials to accompany a United States Army observer section into the Communist areas last July to observe and report on conditions there. The mission was primarily military—to obtain military intelligence relating to such matters as order of battle, air fields, and numerical strength, as well as such correlated matters as weather reports and topography. They wore the Chinese Communist uniforms on the trip.

Traveling mostly by muleback and afoot, the party went over mountain trails and forest tracks, crossing and recrossing the Japanese lines, always accompanied by a strong escort of Chinese guerrillas. The mission went by plane from Chungking to Yen-an and then by mule crossed the Yellow River into the Communist area that forms part of the region supposed to be occupied by the Japanese. The party traversed Shansi and spent a long period in Hopai, and from there various sections of the party made side trips, one pushing as far as Peiping. The return trip was more direct, but over more difficult country, and was made almost 70 percent of the way afoot.

#### MEMBERS OF ROUTE ARMY

Mr. Ludden said the officers and men who accompanied them all were of what the Chinese in the region call the Eighth Route Army, the chief binding link for the various separate administrative groups in the different sections where the Communist bands are active. He said the Chinese considered part of their forces as regulars and part as guerrillas, but that all were what we would call guerrillas, both for their way of life in fastness retreats and their raids and skirmishes with their enemies, the Japanese. One member of the party was killed during one of these skirmishes, and at another time the group was obliged to make a forced march of twenty-six hours without food or rest to escape being intercepted by the Japanese.

Mr. Ludden did not wish to comment on the political situation, but said they all hope for a unified China, and that he found a great admiration for the United States among the soldiers and the people that he encountered in this area.

He said the program supported by the peasants was not particularly Communist in character, but that it was indigenous to the peasantry of China. In its simplest terms the program preached by all these local leaders was in terms that everyone could understand:

"A full belly, a warm back, and nobody knocking them around."

In this period of continuous skirmishing he said the feeling is among these people that "the man who has no gun gets pushed around."

## EXHIBIT No. 26

AMERICAN COUNCIL, INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS, INC.  
 NEW YORK-WASHINGTON, D. C.-CHICAGO-SAN FRANCISCO-HONOLULU  
 1 East 54th Street, New York 22, N. Y.  
 ELdorado 5-1759

JUNE 11, 1945.

The Honorable JOSEPH C. GREW,  
*Department of State, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. GREW: My attention has been drawn to reports in the press alleging that Mr. John S. Service, recently arrested in connection with the release of unauthorized information, held a "press conference under the auspices of the Institute of Pacific Relations" in our Washington office on his return from China. For your information, I would like to state that this report is completely inaccurate, as the Institute of Pacific Relations does not hold press conferences of this character. Mr. Service was one of some seventeen people who had been asked as guests of honor at small sherry parties given by the Washington office for the benefit of members of the American Council living in the Washington area. It is customary on these occasions to ask the guest to talk in as frank a manner as he feels free to about matters of interest to members of the organization, and most of those whom we have invited have complied.

In addition to Mr. Service, we have had such people as Sir Frederick Eggleston, Mr. George Yeh, Mrs. Pandit, Ambassador Paul Naggjar, Senator Carlos Garcia, the Honorable Walter Nash, Mr. Edmund Clubb, Dr. Wang Shih-chieh, and others.

Since both you and Dr. Hornbeck have attended these meetings from time to time, I am sure that you, personally, realize that these press reports about Mr. Service's participation in the press conference were inaccurate, but I did want to set the record straight.

With cordial best wishes,  
 Sincerely yours,

(s) Raymond Dennett  
 RAYMOND DENNETT, *Secretary.*

## EXHIBIT No. 27

In reply refer to CA.

JUNE 18, 1945.

Mr. RAYMOND DENNETT,  
*Secretary, American Council,  
 Institute of Pacific Relations,  
 1 East Fifty-fourth Street, New York 22, N. Y.*

MY DEAR MR. DENNETT: I have received your letter of June 11, 1945, in which you notify me that press reports alleging that Mr. John S. Service had held a press conference under the auspices of the Institute of Pacific Relations in your Washington office are completely inaccurate.

I wish to thank you for your courtesy in bringing the foregoing information to my attention.

Sincerely yours,

(s) JOSEPH C. GREW,  
*Acting Secretary.*

CA: BFDrumright: MS.  
 6-14-45.

X

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

---

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

PURSUANT TO

**S. Res. 231**

A RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER THERE ARE  
EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT  
DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES

---

**PART 3**

JUNE 28, 1950

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1950

68970

**STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION**

---

---

**HEARINGS**

BEFORE A

**SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
UNITED STATES SENATE**

**EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS**

**SECOND SESSION**

PURSUANT TO

**S. Res. 231**

**A RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER THERE ARE  
EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT  
DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES**

---

**PART 3**

**JUNE 28, 1950**

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

TOM CONNALLY, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia	ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan
ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland	H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey
CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida	BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island	HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts
BRIEN McMAHON, Connecticut	
J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas	

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*

C. C. O'DAY, *Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SENATE RESOLUTION 231

MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland, *Chairman*

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island	BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa
BRIEN McMAHON, Connecticut	HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts

EDWARD P. MORGAN, *Chief Counsel*

ROBERT L. HEALD, <i>Assistant Counsel</i>	ROBERT MORRIS, <i>Assistant Counsel</i>
WILLIAM J. KLIMA, <i>Assistant Counsel</i>	LYON L. TYLER, Jr., <i>Assistant Counsel</i>
MARGARET B. BUCHHOLZ, <i>Subcommittee Clerk</i>	

## FOREWORD

Upon the recommendation of the Foreign Relations Committee the following transcript is printed as part 3 of the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 231. The discussion recorded below, which was not included in the original printed hearings, took place at a meeting of the subcommittee on June 28, 1950, at which time members of the subcommittee and the staff were canvassing certain procedural matters. In order that this section of the record may appear in its proper sequence, reference should be made to part 1 of the printed hearings, page 1484. The following exchange, which appears on page 1484, is repeated at this point to afford the necessary continuity:

Mr. MORGAN. I assume, then, that it will not be necessary at this point to incorporate by reading all of this into the record.

Senator TYRINGS. I don't see any point in it, but any member of the committee, anytime, ought to be able to go through this and see anything that we have here.

The additional testimony follows from this point.

My opinion is that a lot of it will be just a waste of time.

Senator GREEN. Have we got answers to all the questions?

Mr. MORGAN. I think, Senator, that a great many of them we have the answers to. Yesterday, for example, Senator Lodge asked for certain reports, I believe, in connection with the case of John Service. The Department of Justice has advised me that they do not have any such reports bearing those dates, and they are sending a letter up concerning the whole matter, which we will have later. So I obviously don't have that.

There are some outstanding requests of the Department of State. There is an outstanding request of the Navy Department. There is, I believe, one outstanding request of the Department of Justice and perhaps another of the War Department. There will be others, but a great many of them have been answered, and, of course, that is the material which I have here today.

Senator LODGE. It seems to me that we ought to also get all the papers of the loyalty board in the Service case, and if the loyalty review board passed on it, we ought to get that. I also would like to have the opportunity to question somebody from the State Department with respect to the quality of Service's record before and after the Amerasia case. It seems to me you have got to do that before you can even pass judgment on that case. I don't know whether we will be turned down or not. The Service case was not 1 of the 81, and we may not be allowed to see any of that stuff, but I think we certainly ought to see it because we want to make a judgment on that matter.

Senator TYDINGS. We will look into that.

Senator McMAHON. I think that somebody would come up and testify as to his competency and conduct as a State Department employee. I would be rather disappointed if they wouldn't.

Senator LODGE. I would, too.

Senator TYDINGS. I think we will get that all right, but whether we will get the record or not is another thing. I will have to explore that before I commit myself.

Mr. MORGAN. Incidentally, for the record at this point, in connection with the Service case, Mr. Peurifoy called me to advise the committee in this session, in the event the matter of Service came up, that the press stories to the effect that the loyalty and security board of the State Department has cleared Service are not accurate. The board has not rendered a decision concerning Service and does not intend to do so, according to Mr. Peurifoy, until the State Department has an opportunity to review our record in executive session, if we make it available to them. Furthermore, he advised that he specifically requested to be disqualified to pass on the Service case and that Under Secretary Webb had agreed to review the decision of the loyalty board at such time as it is formally rendered.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Incidentally, there are a couple questions, based on information that I have received just before noon today, that I would like to ask Mr. Service.

Senator TYDINGS. Would you indicate what they are, Senator?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I would prefer not to.

Senator TYDINGS. The only reason I asked was to see if we had covered any of the ground while you weren't here.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have reviewed the questions that have been asked him, and this happens to be a question to ask him.

Senator TYDINGS. This is new matter, you mean?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It involves other individuals.

Senator TYDINGS. In the State Department?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. No. It involves other individuals with whom he may have had some contact. I have received some information that he had contact with other individuals than those that our record discloses.

Senator TYDINGS. What I mean is, would it be pertinent to our inquiry?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It would, indeed.

Senator TYDINGS. How? Would it bear on his loyalty?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator TYDINGS. You don't care to tell us who they are?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Not at this time, because it is purely rumor. I have just received the information over the telephone and it happened just shortly before noon. This information may or may not be accurate at all.

Senator TYDINGS. Don't you think you ought to have a little more verification of that before we, busy as we all are, go into things of that sort? I don't want to be captious about it or anything of the sort. I am just asking for your opinion. You get a rumor. Is the man that gave the rumor willing to support it with any kind of reasonable fact which would make it worth while inquiring into? We can run rumors down from now on to the year 4006.

Senator LODGE. More than that, Mr. Chairman, we could run down perfectly legitimate questions from now to the year 4006 and still not exhaust all the questions that can be asked within the legitimate purview of Senate Resolution 231. That is the defect of this whole set-up.

Senator TYDINGS. I agree with you.

Senator LODGE. We could work ourselves to the bone, and we have worked hard on this committee, and still not scratched the surface of this subject.

Senator TYDINGS. Let me say this to you. My own thought is, and I want to be completely fair to my colleagues in this matter, is that under Resolution 231, we were instructed to inquire into the loyalty of State Department employees, past or present. In connection with that, we had to look into the loyalty of Mr. Larsen and Mr. Service, who are two State Department employees that were involved in Amerasia. I think that I was very liberal, in the absence of some of the other members of the committee, in letting the whole purview of Amerasia go in, as to whether the Department of Justice had done a good job, whether they had been fixed, which wasn't really what we set out to do. We personally set out to keep it within the State Department purview, and I tried to frame the questions, as the examination and cross-examination will note. It went into all phases of Amerasia, even though at times it seemed to me we were getting pretty far away from loyalty of the employees in the State Department. We went into whether Mr. Hitchcock did a good job or not. We went into whether the FBI did a good job or not. We got pretty far away from the State Department in many of our phases. However, it was all done in good faith and in order to be broad and liberal and fair about it.

Now, likewise, in the Lattimore case, Mr. Lattimore never was an employee of the State Department. Nevertheless, we had a great deal



of testimony about Mr. Lattimore and his books and writings and this, that and the other thing. I have done my best and with some success. When nobody thought we were going to get the 81 loyalty files, I went down and got them. I didn't know what was in them.

Senator McMAHON. Untampered with.

Senator TYDINGS. Untampered with. After the charge was made that they had been tampered with, I went to the FBI and said I wanted a check made of this, that if they had been tampered with, I wanted to know it. I am very hopeful that, having proceeded in that vein, we can more and more get back within the purview of the resolution and that we can conclude this hearing, because it is going to take a long while for us to make a study of this and see what report we are going to make. We probably will not agree on many phases of it. Quite frankly, I feel that we have done a good job. We have gone into it and we have all worked hard. This can be off the record.

(Off the record.)

Senator LODGE. Let me make a little statement, Mr. Chairman.

Senator TYDINGS. Certainly.

Senator LODGE. I agree that this committee has worked very hard. I think the staff has worked hard. I want to compliment them on the way they have worked. I know the Senators have put in a tremendous amount of time on this whole matter. However, Senate Resolution 231 is, and I think I can quote it right here, "to investigate persons who are disloyal to the United States who are or have been"—I underlined those three words, "or have been"—"employed by the Department of State."

Now, when you go into that, there are a whole lot of questions that suggest themselves to you that without any strained construction at all are squarely within that purview. I have just jotted down a few of them here that have been asked on the floor by Senators and that have been asked in the press, some of which would take months and years to go into.

What State Department officials were responsible for placing Hiss and Wadleigh in the State Department?

Have we investigated what person or persons were primarily responsible for sponsorship of employment of sexual perverts in the State Department?

Senator TYDINGS. Do you want all this on the record?

Senator LODGE. Yes. I think it would be a good thing for the men who wrote this Senate Resolution 231 to see, because some of them didn't understand what they were getting into.

Has an investigation been made with a view to determining whether those State Department officials who opposed United States recognition of Soviet Russia and who thereafter warned against any appeasement of the Soviet regime were in any way discriminated against or unfairly treated by the Department?

Has an investigation been made of the procedures whereby Communists gain entry into the United States upon the basis of visas obtained through our consular service abroad?

Has an investigation been made with reference to the release of the Soviet spy named Gaik Badalovich Ovakimian on July 23, 1941?

Has an investigation been made with reference to the release of the Soviet spy named Mikhala Nickolavich Goran on March 22, 1941?

Have questions been addressed to Adolph Berle with reference to his statement to the House Un-American Activities Committee that Alger Hiss belonged to the pro-Russian clique in the State Department?

Who in the State Department was responsible for obtaining the services of Frederick Schuman and Owen Lattimore as speakers for the Department's indoctrination course for Foreign Service employees? I have had many people ask me that.

Has the subcommittee investigated the charge that a State Department security officer whose decision that 10 members of the Department be discharged was subsequently reversed by higher authority?

What State Department officials were responsible for the advice given higher officials that the Soviet Government would allow free elections in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the other satellite countries?

Has the subcommittee investigated the facts surrounding the case of Arthur Adams, an alleged Soviet atom spy, who was permitted to leave the United States in 1946?

Now, any one of those questions would be good for 6, 7, or 8 months of the year.

Senator TYDINGS. That is right.

Senator LODGE. Take the Lattimore case alone. We have got nothing in the record to show where Lattimore's precise relationship with the State Department has been set forth by an official of the State Department. I don't think the State Department has answered for the record, whether the relationship to the State Department which Senator McCarthy applied to Lattimore was correct or not.

Senator TYDINGS. How about the four letters from the Secretaries of State?

Senator LODGE. Do you think that that completely clears up his relationship with the State Department?

Senator TYDINGS. I think as far as that phase of it is concerned, they said they didn't know him, that as far as they knew, he had no influence in molding foreign policy.

Senator LODGE. They said that, but did they set forth his exact place on the Reparations Commission to Japan, his exact appointment as lecturer?

Senator TYDINGS. That has all been testified to, that he was appointed at the request of Ed Pauley on the Presidential Mission, not with the State Department. That is in the record.

Senator LODGE. All right, I will look it up again.

Senator TYDINGS. I remember it.

Senator LODGE. Let me ask you this: Has the subcommittee questioned all persons mentioned by Budenz as having had relations with Lattimore?

Senator TYDINGS. Yes.

Senator LODGE. Have we all of them?

Mr. MORGAN. All persons?

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. In what sense?

Senator LODGE. Have we had them in and questioned all the persons mentioned by Budenz as having had relations with Lattimore?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Budenz named in executive session a great many contributors to Pacific Affairs, the publication with which Lattimore

at one time was associated. Of course, we have not interviewed all of them. There were some 16, as I remember.

Senator TYDINGS. Lattimore specifically answered each one of the charges that Budenz had made or that anybody had made. I remember that in his testimony. I don't recall it specifically, but I do know he took up one thing after another.

Senator LODGE. We haven't questioned them all, I don't think.

Mr. MORRIS. Lattimore hasn't been in since the second Budenz testimony.

Senator LODGE. Have we questioned those who have headed the China desk in the State Department to determine whether Lattimore gave advice on United States policy for China and whether this advice was acted upon?

Have we questioned the United States Ambassadors to China who were there during that period in order to get answers to those questions?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In that connection, may I say that I talked to them about 4 weeks ago. I have been trying to locate their signatures so that I can present them. I talked to a Chinese representative here who told me that in discussing Chinese matters with the State Department he had been on repeated occasions sent to Owen Lattimore from the Far East Section of the State Department. They said, "Well, you see Lattimore about that."

Senator TYDINGS. Well, what of it? That doesn't make him an employee of the State Department.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. No; but it goes to the question of his influence.

Senator TYDINGS. We are not trying his influence. We are investigating whether State Department employees have been disloyal, and Lattimore is not a State Department employee.

Senator LODGE. I would like to just complete this; it wouldn't take me very long.

Senator TYDINGS. Excuse me.

Senator LODGE. On the question of asking the Department of Justice whether they have had any new information respecting Lattimore since that date, I think it was March 24 that we went down and saw the summary of the file.

Senator TYDINGS. By "new information," do you mean derogatory or general information?

Senator LODGE. I understand they were conducting a surveillance of them or an examination of them or a study into them.

Mr. MORRIS. As I understand it, they had 70 FBI men working on Lattimore subsequent to that.

Senator TYDINGS. Who told you that?

Mr. MORRIS. Well, I heard that from about four or five different sources.

Senator TYDINGS. Name me one, so we can judge and measure the authenticity of what you heard.

Mr. MORRIS. One of them was a man named Nelson Frank.

Senator TYDINGS. Who is he?

Mr. MORRIS. He is a man who used to work for the Navy. He is a newspaperman. He is in New York. Apparently he is recognized by the Bureau as something of an expert on Communist literature. He gets frequent calls from the FBI.

Senator TYDINGS. What are we trying to find out about Lattimore, Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. I think the principal charge is he was the architect for our far eastern policy.

Senator TYDINGS. How does what you told me, 70 men of the FBI looking into it, make him the architect of our far eastern policy?

Mr. MORRIS. I am sorry, I didn't hear that question.

Senator TYDINGS. How could he be the formulator of policy if he wasn't in the State Department?

Mr. MORRIS. I can think of one thing. He was one of the principal consultants last October, when they had the conference.

Senator LODGE. The question I raised was very simple. On the question of asking the Department of Justice whether they had any new information since March 24, they can say, yes, we have and we don't want to tell you or they can say no, we don't have, or yes, we have.

Senator TYDINGS. I shall ask that question and put the letter in the record. I think it is a very proper question.

Senator LODGE. They asked us all to come down and look at this summary.

Senator TYDINGS. I think it is a very proper question.

Senator LODGE. It is just a question of bringing the thing up to date.

Senator TYDINGS. That is right.

Senator LODGE. Now, at the hearing on April 25, Budenz stated that he would furnish the subcommittee with names of Communists whom he knew to be in the State Department. Have we received that list?

Senator TYDINGS. Yes, I have got a letter from him in which he says he has been very busy and hasn't had time to get around to this yet, that sometime in the autumn he hopes to have time to devote some attention to this.

Senator LODGE. Budenz says that?

Senator TYDINGS. Yes.

Senator LODGE. Will that letter be in the record?

Senator TYDINGS. You will put it in the record.

Senator LODGE. I think it ought to be in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. I have got the letter somewhere. The reason I haven't brought it over here is that I didn't think of it, for one thing. Another thing is he says he wouldn't be able to do something until autumn. He sent a copy of it to each one. He says on the letter to me a copy to so and so and so and so. I think every member of the committee got a copy of it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I got a copy.

Senator TYDINGS. He says that on there. That is the reason I didn't bring it up.

Senator LODGE. I think it ought to be in the record for the sake of completeness.

Mr. MORGAN. I have my copy to incorporate in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. You have got a copy. Put it in the record. That will take care of that.

Senator LODGE. Have we contacted and investigated all those whom Lattimore is supposed to have brought in to the Institute of Pacific Relations? If not, I think we ought to do something about that.

Mr. MORGAN. That, Senator, is a bridge that I think we ought to cross right here. To propose to undertake an investigation of that

character, you might just as well give up all hope, with the existing facilities, and you might as well get set for an investigation that will extend over 1 year at the very least.

Senator LODGE. All right, now, I want to talk about that. I want to make my little speech about that. I have asked all these questions, and I think the questions are obviously questions that fall within the purview of this Senate resolution. However, with the congressional committee machinery, we could sit for another year or 2 years and we still couldn't get to the bottom of all those questions. In all the years I have been here, I have never been on a committee where people worked harder and where a more sincere effort was made.

Senator TYDINGS. I have had to do 3 or 4 hours on the committee in addition.

Senator LODGE. You are the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and you have a lot of other things to do. I have never been on any other committee where the members put in more time and worked harder. However, the nature of a congressional committee is such that the Senators haven't the time and, in most cases, haven't the expert background, and the tools which a congressional committee has, which are the publicity and the furnishing of facts on which public opinion is formed, are not the tools that you need to apprehend the existence of disloyalty in Government departments. What you need there are detectives and secret work, which a Congressional committee does not have. So I think that if we sat from now until doomsday, this committee, with the other things it has to do, which we as Senators have got to do, which are just as important as this, could never get to the bottom of the question of who hired Alger Hiss or how about all these people that Lattimore got into the Institute of Pacific Relations. Therefore, at the proper time, I am going to renew my motion that a trained bipartisan commission of experts be set up to go into this thing, under the seal of secrecy, with a definite requirement that no report be made until well after the election, taking this whole thing out of politics, getting to the bottom of it, and let the chips fall where they may. That is the system that has been tried in other countries and they have gotten a lot of results from it.

I wanted to make that statement fully and frankly here, because I intend to make it in public later, and I don't want to have you gentlemen learn my views in public for the first time. I want you to hear it here.

Senator TYDINGS. I think there is a great deal, Senator Lodge, in what you say. I am not out of sympathy or in disagreement with any of the fundamentals you have expressed. Take my own situation first. In addition to what each other member of the committee has had to put in on this, I have had to put in probably 2 hours extra each day because of the mail coming to me, and I have carried, you can imagine, a pretty heavy load here.

Now, I think we have done a pretty thorough job. I don't say that we have explored every bay and inlet and river and rivulet or we haven't explored it. I am not passing on that. What I would like to do is to take what we have got and present it to the Senate and come to some recommendation that we might all agree upon for a further continuance of this thing. Now, I can't see where anybody can be hurt on that score. My own conscience will be clear and

my sense of the discharge of the duty will be clear, because I have worked like the devil on this case.

Senator LODGE. I don't understand what you say about a continuance.

Senator TYDINGS. I say, we will take the evidence that we have now and make any conclusion we want from it, either in agreement or three different versions or five different versions, or any way we want to do it, and that incorporated in our general findings there be some provision and recommendations for a further pursuit of security under whatever mechanics we decide, either along your line or some other line.

Senator LODGE. Not necessarily by this same subcommittee?

Senator TYDINGS. We would be out. They would take it over and go ahead with it. I don't think we can do much more than we have done. I think it is like a sculptor. He takes his clay and he gets it in general shape. Now we are down to where the refinements come in, and we haven't got the time to go into all these things. My opinion is that we ought to make our findings on what we have and make a recommendation, which I am sure will be honored, that there be further pursuit of this proposition. By that, I don't mean this particular evidence. I mean anything that is in the picture at all that has to do with better security for the country, I am with it.

Senator LODGE. Off the record.

(Off the record.)

Senator TYDINGS. I haven't talked this over with my colleagues; I will tell you that in good faith. I haven't talked it over with Senator Green or Senator McMahon, but I have reached the conclusion that I want above everything else, this country to be secure against the bad people in it, particularly in the present time. While I have done the best I could do, and I think a pretty good job was done by all of us, in getting the essentials of what brought us into being before us for some consideration, I am not content to leave the matter go without further pursuit by people who have the time and the effort and everything else that can be made to do the job.

Senator GREEN. I may say I am in entire sympathy with the general principles, but whether I would be for any particular plan will be another matter.

I ought to be excused. I talked with my office and there are people who have been waiting for sometime over there to see me.

Senator TYDINGS. I would like to get some expression from you, Senator Green. I would like to get this from you today. I would like to have Mr. Morgan complete this record with such other information as has been requested to be furnished us in writing. Then I would like to have all of this made available and have the committee make whatever findings it wants to make and ask for such other pursuit of it as is necessary. I have no objection. I don't care. I don't want to drop it.

Senator GREEN. Somebody ought to make a tentative draft. That is the only possible way of getting at it.

Senator TYDINGS. I mean the committee ought to bring in its findings. We can say they are imperfect, if we want, or we can say that we have done the best we can.

Senator GREEN. My point is to get down to earth. Someone has got to make those findings or a draft in order that we may come to an agreement.

Senator TYDINGS. Make a motion, then, so we can get your point of view on paper.

Senator GREEN. Well, I would suggest that the counsel for the committee make a draft report for this committee that we can discuss, in the first place. When you once have that draft report and have been over that, then we can discuss the findings.

Mr. MORRIS. May I say, Senator, that the first basic request that I made in commencing this investigation was for the books and records of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, inasmuch as there was evidence that his money was the heart of the Communist cell in the Institute of Pacific Relations. I maintain that that was necessary. It was basically necessary to start that kind of an investigation.

Senator TYDINGS. There isn't anything, Mr. Morris, that isn't pertinent, and we can keep on asking for things, and there is no doubt in the world that would be a good thing to get, and you could ask for 5,000 different things, but we are pretty far away from loyalty in the State Department when we get out in the Institute of Pacific Relations with our little force. We just haven't got it.

Are you ready for a discussion?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I want to make an observation on that. I think it would be an utterly futile thing to make a draft report at this time. I consider we haven't even scratched the surface.

Senator TYDINGS. How long do you think it would take us to do it?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I don't know how long it will take us, but I would like to see us get into some of the ramifications of these witnesses as the only way way that you can develop evidence upon which you can base any final conclusions, and I will have to oppose such a motion at this time.

Senator GREEN. It seems to me that we have done all that we need to do in connection with the job that was imposed upon us. We have examined the case of everyone who has been accused, by name or by number corresponding to the name.

Senator LODGE. If the Senator will yield, we were not directed by the resolution to do that.

Senator GREEN. No, but we have not supplied want ads in the paper to find additional ones. We have had plenty of publicity about this committee's work, and we would have had other names suggested to us if these people who are constantly writing letters to us had names to offer.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. We have 20 or 30 names that I think we ought to look into.

Senator GREEN. I say, all that have been presented to the committee, I think we have examined.

Senator TYDINGS. I think we ought to reach a decision here today. I think we have done an exceedingly hard lot of work. This committee has worked hard and turned up all the essential facts. We have got to admit that there is a great field of endeavor here which we, as Cabot says, are not qualified to do. It would take us years, take much more money, take more investigators.

Senator GREEN. The point was to see whether there were present any cases of disloyalty in the State Department, or former employees of the State Department now in other Government departments. I think we have examined every case that comes within those two categories, and I think that was our duty. We want to make a report and file it and go on with other committees to continue the job that is considered necessary.

Senator TYDINGS. Is there any further discussion?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes. Before we vote on this matter, I would like to suggest a "for instance." I am compiling a list right now, which I will have this afternoon and you can have tomorrow afternoon, a list of a substantial number of witnesses to whom the trails in this thing lead.

Senator GREEN. Do they come under those two categories?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes, indeed—associations and connections in the State Department.

Senator GREEN. I think that is going on a fishing expedition. A witness who may know of something in the State Department is one thing, but if you can give us the name of anyone in the State Department on whom there are reasonable grounds for suspecting his disloyalty will be another thing.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. For instance, I would like to make a request at this moment, that Maj. Gen. C. A. Willoughby, Assistant Chief of Staff in G-2, General Headquarters in the Far Eastern Command, under General MacArthur, furnish a review of the sort in the Smedly case, with special reference to their American associations.

Senator TYDINGS. I think, Senator Hickenlooper, without taking issue with you, we could sit here and probably think of a thousand pertinent sidelights, and some of them would be more than sidelights, perhaps.

Senator GREEN. Excuse me, I started to leave. I am afraid I will have to leave in the middle of this.

Senator TYDINGS. Let's have a decision, Senator Green. Your motion is pending. Are you ready for the question?

Senator GREEN. I would like to have a vote on it.

Senator LODGE. That is, to have the counsel prepare a report?

Senator TYDINGS. And submit it to us on the evidence up to date.

Senator McMAHON. That doesn't commit us to anything except seeing a compendium of what we have got.

Senator TYDINGS. You are going to have to do this sometime. You might as well walk up to it now. There never will be a point where you will be finished.

Senator McMAHON. I personally, in voting for this motion, want it understood as meaning in my mind that we are going to have an orderly presentation of the work of the committee to date. When I take a look at that report—I shouldn't call it a report; I should call it a memorandum of work that has been done—it would be very helpful to me in charting what I think should be the future course of the committee.

Senator GREEN. That is my suggestion.

Senator LODGE. Is it your thought that there should be a draft of a final report?

Senator GREEN. To date.



Senator LODGE. I don't like that word "final." I don't think the public will take it as final.

Senator GREEN. A draft to date of the work we have accomplished is what I would like to see. Can we decide we ought to fill in this gap or that gap or decide we ought to do this or follow up something else, so that we can have a definite statement of what we have done up to date?

Senator TYDINGS. My point is this, that we ought to take our hearings as of today, and we ought to have a report drafted for them to see whether we can agree to turn this over to the full committee, with our recommendations about its pursuit of this whole field of operations thereon.

Senator GREEN. We may make a great many changes in the report.

Senator TYDINGS. We wouldn't all agree, we will want this changed and that changed, but we will have to start sometime. I imagine the report will be pretty long. We have got a hundred-and-some people to deal with.

Senator LODGE. Let me say this. I think that I have some basic assumptions about this whole situation, which will not make it possible for me to sign this report.

Senator TYDINGS. I would suggest as an alternative that each man draw his own report and submit it and see where we can meet.

Senator LODGE. I have no objection to the staff working up any kind of a document that they desire, but I want to make it clear that as far as I am concerned, I don't think I will be able to sign it, because my basic assumptions about this whole proceeding are different.

Senator TYDINGS. That is all right. I am willing to start on my report. What I would like to do is get it here and tell you what I am going to say, and if you don't agree with it, make one of your own, but I want a report on the work. I think our work is pretty well concluded, if you want my opinion.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I don't think it has even started, Mr. Chairman.

Senator TYDINGS. You disagree with me?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I disagree with you.

Senator TYDINGS. But I disagree with you, so there we are.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, may I mention just one case here?

Senator TYDINGS. Mr. MORRIS, we can mention cases from now until doomsday.

Mr. MORRIS. It is in the record, Senator. May I just finish?

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, you are not a member of the committee. When we want counsel to speak, we will ask them, but I am going to let you speak. However, that is a matter for the committee to decide.

Senator LODGE. I would like to hear what he has to say.

Mr. MORRIS. There is a case of a man named Theodore Geiger. He has been an employee of the State Department. He is now one of Paul Hoffman's top assistants. He is doing work that is quasi-State Department in character. I have gone and gotten some witnesses together who will testify that he was a member of the same Communist Party unit as they were, and I think that we would be delinquent if in the face of this evidence that is now on the record—

Senator TYDINGS. Why didn't you tell us this? Why did you wait until this hour to tell me?

Mr. MORRIS. I am not waiting, Senator. One day Senator Green made me a witness and I put it all in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. You haven't told me about it. This is the first I have heard about it.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, I assume that you are aware of everything in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. No. There are some things in the record I haven't been able to read.

Mr. MORRIS. Certainly Mr. Morgan knows it. I have mentioned it several times to him.

Senator GREEN. That wouldn't have anything to do with my motion.

Senator TYDINGS. Turn it over to the FBI or do something else with it. I would like to get a decision here. We don't want to waste this afternoon.

Senator Green has recommended that the counsel prepare a report which will review the work that we have done, and that it may be used as a basis for committee action or individual action upon the matters we have already had under examination. Is that substantially it?

Senator GREEN. That is substantially it, yes.

Senator TYDINGS. Do you want to add to it?

Senator GREEN. No. I accepted that as a basis for conclusions which we may later reach.

Senator McMAHON. Before voting I would like to say that I think it is a profitable thing to do, because we have been in existence now for how long, Mr. Chairman?

Senator TYDINGS. We are going on our fifth month.

Senator McMAHON. Fifth month. I would like to see a review, and in a form that I can very easily digest, of what we have already adduced in the record and, measuring that against our resolution of instructions, to see exactly where, in my mind, we are, and it is for that purpose of being helpful to me that I vote aye on the motion.

Senator TYDINGS. All those in favor will signify by saying "aye."

(Chorus of "ayes.")

Senator TYDINGS. Opposed?

(Chorus of "noes.")

Senator TYDINGS. All those in favor will signify by raising their hands.

(A show of hands.)

Senator McMAHON. Before we finally take a record vote, can I ask the basis of the objection for getting counsel to submit a brief to us? Perhaps I don't understand.

Senator LODGE. I have many basic objections.

Senator McMAHON. It seems to me like a sensible thing to make use of our counsel to give us a brief of what we have already done.

Senator LODGE. In the first place, there is the use of the word "conclusion" or "concluding," which Senator Green inserted into his motion. Senator Green is a man who understands the language and uses it very carefully, as I have had occasion to learn many times from my associations with him. The idea of that word "conclusion" is flatly at variance with my idea that this thing is by no means concluded and will not be concluded until we have a trained bipartisan commission that will make an independent investigation. That is one thing. Sec-

ondly, my whole basic assumption about this whole situation is so different that I think I would be misconstruing my own position if I were to vote for this particular motion.

Senator GREEN. We must make some sort of a report, must we not?

Senator LODGE. My position is that the thing we ought to do is to report out a resolution, setting up a trained bipartisan commission of experts to make an independent investigation.

Senator GREEN. That may be a conclusion, but we must make a report of what we have done, surely.

Senator TYDINGS. Cabot, what will we do with what we have already done; take it down and turn it over to them without reaching any conclusions?

Senator GREEN. Conclusions are a separate matter. It doesn't have to be a conclusion, not this report. It is just for a basis.

Senator LODGE. A basis for conclusions.

Senator GREEN. In other words, the conclusion might be that we can't reach any definite conclusion. That might be the conclusion we will reach.

Senator LODGE. I think you have got the votes to carry the motion.

Senator TYDINGS. I don't want to carry any motion by sheer force.

Senator McMAHON. I tried to frame what I interpret it to be, a working paper to give me the benefit of what has already been done in this committee period. Now what I do with the working memorandum when I get it and read it is a horse of another color. But I can't see why counsel can't prepare a working memorandum and submit it to us without any vote at all. I am quite willing to vote.

Senator GREEN. I've got to go. It is always a half hour, or another hour, or 2 hours.

Senator TYDINGS. I know, but this may save you two or three more committee meetings, where we would go over the same ground again.

Let me suggest that counsel prepare a tentative report to submit to the members of this committee, that each man prepare, if he wishes, such report as he wants and such recommendations as he wants, and that we pool those here and see if we can reach collectively or individually a basis for bringing our present hearings to a close and passing it on with recommendations for further action.

Senator GREEN. If it would suit Senator Lodge better, I would just call it an interim report.

Senator LODGE. You see, I start in with this basic assumption.

Senator TYDINGS. Would you object to an interim report?

Senator LODGE. I don't object to your telling Mr. Morgan as chief counsel to prepare a summary of the testimony today, if you want to, although to me it wouldn't be a document of much significance.

Senator TYDINGS. What I wanted to do was to find out whether we could tell the country what we found out up to now and then go on from there in any other field we want.

Senator LODGE. Let me answer you this way. My basic assumption is that in 1945, at the end of VE-day, those who were running this Government utterly failed to sense the new realities of the situation; that that showed itself in the fact that no reason was ever given for maintaining our Armed Forces; so that a clamor developed to not just demobilize, but to disintegrate our Armed Forces to a point where we had no influence left. In the case of the State Department, that

revealed itself in this carrying into the service of the State Department 4,000 people from these temporary war agencies, with no screening whatever, many of whom were totally unfit to be in the Government.

Senator GREEN. That all ought to be in the report.

Senator TYDINGS. It is in the report already.

Senator LODGE. That the administration in 1945 totally failed to sense the realities of the world situation.

Senator TYDINGS. Yes, sir, it is all in there.

Senator LODGE. I will be interested to read that.

Senator TYDINGS. It is all in there. We have got a complete explanation of it.

Senator LODGE. I would like to see that report before I vote.

Senator GREEN. Certainly.

Senator LODGE. If it has got that in there it will be interesting.

Senator TYDINGS. There isn't anything that isn't completely open and aboveboard.

Senator McMAHON. I deny that it is in the record, that at the end of the war the administration totally failed—I deny that that is in the record.

Senator LODGE. I thought you would.

Senator McMAHON. I, incidentally, deny the truth of it.

Senator LODGE. I thought you would.

Senator McMAHON. If you want to say it was the administration, say it was the American people, all the American people, everybody in the world, but that is immaterial to this record.

Senator LODGE. Senator, if the leaders of this country had said to the American people that we must maintain our Armed Forces of a certain size and bear a certain relation to the other armed forces in the world, the clamor to demobilize would never have arisen. It was the lack of real leadership. The reason we are in such trouble today is because of that.

Senator TYDINGS. My dear friend, we have got a proposition before us whereby we have been working going on our fifth month. We have assembled a vast amount of evidence about matters that are pertinent to this inquiry and upon which the public ought to be informed. The suggestion before us is that counsel prepare a report on the evidence we have taken up to now. It doesn't necessarily mean that we have to quit there or stop there. We can do whatever we please. But I would like to make a report on what we have done up to now, with recommendations flowing from that about what should be done in the future. Now, could there be any objection to that?

Senator LODGE. I understand that the text has already been drafted of this report; is that right?

Senator TYDINGS. I have asked Mr. Morgan to keep his text as current as he could. He has got a lot of it done. I haven't read it.

Senator LODGE. Why do you need the motion if he is writing it?

Senator TYDINGS. Senator Hickenlooper got one current, and you have got one current. Now let me get this straight. All you have got before you is this: Here is our evidence.

Senator GREEN. What are you arguing for?

Senator TYDINGS. Will you let me make this statement?

Senator GREEN. Yes; certainly.

Senator TYDINGS. Here is our evidence. Why shouldn't we make a finding on the evidence we have got up to now, plus such recommendations as we want to make based on the evidence?

Senator GREEN. I want to get the statement of evidence before I make any findings.

Senator TYDINGS. I am not talking about findings.

Senator GREEN. You just said findings.

Senator TYDINGS. I said we ought to make a report based on the evidence up to now.

Senator GREEN. You said findings.

Senator TYDINGS. Well, do you want to vote on it?

Senator McMAHON. Does that include the 81 down at the White House?

Senator TYDINGS. It looks to be like we are just afraid. What are we afraid about?

Senator LODGE. I am not afraid to make my report.

Senator McMAHON. Nor I mine.

Senator TYDINGS. All those in favor of the Green resolution will signify by saying "aye."

Senator GREEN. Aye.

Senator McMAHON. Aye.

Senator TYDINGS. All those opposed signify by saying "no."

Senator LODGE. No.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. No.

Senator TYDINGS. Two votes no and two the other way.

Go ahead, Mr. Morgan, and prepare your report. The meeting is in recess.

Senator McMAHON. I never saw a committee where the committee did not vote unanimously to have a report of its work brought to its attention.

Senator LODGE. That shows how controversial this subject is.

Mr. MORGAN. Pursuant to the committee's approval of this action, I am at this point incorporating in the record all of the various items which we thus far have collected in the office of the staff.

(These items are included in the appendix to the record at pp. 1756 to 2509.)

(Whereupon, at 3:50 p. m., the committee adjourned.)